

Also, resolutions of Cannery League of California, favoring cooperation between Federal and State Governments for rivers, harbors, and inland waterways development; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of Society Sons of Revolution in the State of California, favoring development of practicable system of national preparedness against war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Oakland Chamber of Commerce, favoring additional appropriations for improvements in equipment of Geodetic Survey on Pacific coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Commodore Council, No. 14, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wakefield, R. I., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of Travelers' Protective Association, in convention at Omaha, Nebr., favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Ogdensburg, Pa., relative to increased efficiency and compensation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of C. H. Anschutz, of Tawas City, Mich., favoring embargo on munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Petition of sundry citizens of Hill County, Tex., against any great increase of taxes for purposes of preparedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Neutrality and Peace Convention, at San Francisco, Cal., favoring an embargo on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of St. Louis Waiters' Union, Local No. 20, F. S. Elliott, and Robert J. Fritz, all of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of St. Louis Moving Picture and Projecting Machine Operators Union, Local No. 143, and Awning Workers' Union, No. 14667, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Journeymen Steamfitters and Helpers, No. 562; International Association of Pile Drivers, Local No. 43; Future City Lodge, No. 1; Badge and Lodge Paraphernalia Makers' Union, No. 9136; Soda and Mineral Water Employees' Union, No. 14797; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Local No. 1011; World's Fair Lodge, No. 390; the Order of Railway Telegraphers, Missouri Pacific Division, No. 31; G. B. B. Association of United States and Canada, No. 5; International Hod Carriers, Local Union No. 284; International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, Local No. 41; Brotherhood Railway Car Men, Mountain Lodge, No. 19; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Local No. 45; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers, No. 204; Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, Local No. 102, all of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of William G. Pettus and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging embargo on munitions of war, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, urging passage of Senate joint resolution 60 relative to legislation bearing upon shippers, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Travelers' Protective Association of America, favoring law relative to unfair competition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Louis W. Carlisle Camp, No. 56, United Spanish War Veterans, of Watertown, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Louis W. Carlisle Camp, No. 56, United Spanish War Veterans, of Watertown, N. Y., favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of the Williams & Carleton Co., of Hartford, Conn., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Admiral Bunce Section, No. 42, Navy League of the United States, of Hartford, Conn., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of Gorham Manufacturing Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring increased appropriations for governmental work in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorials of Homer Bleach & Dye Works and Union Webbing Co., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorials of Rev. Edward R. Evans, Annabel L. Berry, Sarah J. Eddy, Rhode Island Federation of Labor, and Albert C. Rider, of Rhode Island, favoring the Keating-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Commodore Perry Council, No. 14, favoring more strict laws governing admission of foreigners to this country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of E. J. Waters, of Providence, R. I., protesting against any embargo on arms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. George McClellan Fiske, in favor of the Keating-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petitions of Ludwig Tuler and 24 citizens and J. J. Danch, of Sandusky, Ohio, and German-American Alliance, of Bellevue, Ohio, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirty-ninth congressional district of New York, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHALL: Memorial from the business men of Cambridge, Sandstone, Hinckley, Anoka, Braham, Mora, Rush City, Foreston, Lindstrom, Center City, North Branch, Pine City, Montrose, Wayzata, Long Lake, Princeton, Excelsior, Hopkins, St. Bonifacius, Maple Plain, Taylors Falls, Stanchfield, Ogilvie, Brook Park, Isanti, Rockford, Harris, Delano, Oak Park, Chisago City, Rock Creek, Buffalo, Annandale, Cokato, Dassel, Howard Lake, Waverly, Minn., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Fred Van Brunt and Edward H. Van Camp, of Long Branch, N. J., favoring embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of New Jersey Society Sons of American Revolution, favoring erection of national archives building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Daughters of Liberty, Cedar Run, N. J., favoring passage of Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Stockton (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, favoring passage of Stevens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNELL: Memorial of Ogdensburg Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Commodore Perry Council, No. 14, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wakefield, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, favoring House resolution, granting the erection of a monument in Arlington Cemetery to the nuns of the battle field; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 4624, granting an increase of pension to George H. Naylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: Petition of Walsh Paper Co., Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of K. S. Ramsett, Fingal, N. Dak., and 272 other merchants, favoring Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, January 29, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray Thy blessing upon these Thy servants whom Thou hast in Thy providence placed in positions of great responsibility and power. There is no phase of the work committed to their hands that does not pertain to the interests of the larger life and of the higher kingdom. Thou hast a purpose and a plan in all that Thou dost require at the hands of this honorable Senate.

O God, give that clearness of discernment, that calmness of thought, that evenness of temperament, that likeness to Christ to Thy servants that they may well perform the duties committed to them, and that each day they may enjoy the blessed

satisfaction of having given something of their lives to the advancement of the interests of humanity and the extension of the kingdom of God. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LIST OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 265).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to the order of the court, a list of cases referred to the Court of Claims by the United States Senate, which cases were dismissed by the court under the act of March 4, 1915, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H. R. 2180. An act for the relief of Albert Greenlaw;
- H. R. 2288. An act for the relief of Thomas R. Mason;
- H. R. 4530. An act for the relief of Michael F. O'Hare;
- H. R. 5835. An act for the relief of James Stanton;
- H. R. 7248. An act for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co.;
- H. R. 8318. An act for the relief of De Barbieri & Co., of Valparaiso, Chile; and
- H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present resolutions adopted by the Jacksonville (Fla.) Branch of the National Security League, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Article IV, section 4, of the Federal Constitution provides "that the United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government and shall protect each of them from invasion"; and

Whereas statements in the annual reports of the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and in the reports of the military and naval heads of departments appended thereto prove that the defense of this country are inadequate and would be ineffective in the event of foreign invasion; and

Whereas an attack waged against any part of the United States would be felt with equal hardship by all citizens of the United States on account of the distributed holdings of securities, etc., and the need for requiring men for an army of defense from each State in the Union: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Jacksonville Branch of the National Security League in conference as follows, to wit:

First. We favor such an increase in our Navy that it will be second to none in the world and one that will demand the respect of all nations for our commerce and trade on the high seas, and efficient to maintain the first line of defense on both the coasts of these United States.

Second. We favor a substantial increase of our Regular Army.

Third. We favor sufficient appropriations to place our National Guard on a proportional-pay basis and provide for ample instruction for these volunteer forces; as it is our belief that only through the National Guard is it possible to train a citizen army in times of peace.

Fourth. We favor the organization of cadet companies, as contemplated in the War Department bill now under consideration, and a corps of citizen officers who can supply the needs of a volunteer army in time of need.

Fifth. We also favor the holding of student camps as conducted by the War Department last year.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States from Florida and they, respectively, be requested by the chairman of this branch of the National Security League to favor and support the increased appropriations of Congress to establish an efficient Navy and Army and a National Guard and officer corps along the lines and views herein expressed.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of resolutions adopted December 20, 1915.

CROMWELL GIBBONS,
Chairman Jacksonville (Fla.) Branch
National Security League.

Attest:

ERNEST METCALFE, Secretary.

Mr. GRONNA. I present resolutions adopted by the Burleigh County Farmers' Union, in convention assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., against an increase in armaments. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the Burleigh County Farmers' Union, in the quarterly convention assembled at Bismarck, N. Dak., December 10, 1915.

Whereas more than 60 per cent of all the Federal revenues are now used for war expenses, a burden that is already too heavy to be borne by the producing classes without protest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we demand economy in all appropriations made by Congress, and that we are especially opposed to any great increase in expenditures for the Army and Navy, but approve a reasonable outlay for coast defense by submarines and other agencies proved by recent experience to be effective for that purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed to a large standing Army and to any change in our military system tending to compulsory military service; and be it further

Resolved, That we demand that our Senators and Congressmen use their votes and influence to prevent the appropriation of any unreasonable amount of money for war preparedness and Army and Navy increases. We demand that Congress redeem all pledges made to the farmers and proceed at once to enact a rural credits law, a law against gambling in produce options on boards of trade, a law providing for national standards for grain grading and inspection, and a law creating a national bureau of markets, all of which were endorsed by the national convention of the Farmers' Union at Lincoln, Nebr., on September 8, 1915; and be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from North Dakota and to the local papers of Burleigh County, N. Dak., for publication, and that a copy be spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

J. F. PERKINS, Chairman,
E. A. TRYGG,
H. W. RUPP,
C. O. KELL,
H. P. KNAPPEN,
Committee on Resolutions.

Submitted by C. F. Lindsey, secretary-treasurer, Regan, N. Dak.

Mr. GRONNA presented the memorial of Nick Thinner, of Rock Lake, N. Dak., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition adopted by the American Neutrality and Peace Convention, held at San Francisco, Cal., praying for an investigation by Congress of alleged violations of neutrality, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KENYON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Sigourney, Iowa, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation limiting the free use of the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. STERLING presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Huron, S. Dak., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LIPPITT presented a petition of Fred L. Sayles Co., of Pascoag, R. I., praying for the imposition of a tax on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present a resolution, being a favorable report from the Committee on Printing, and I should like to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 87) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the report entitled "Electric Power Development in the United States and Concentration in its Ownership and Control," transmitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Agriculture on January 20, 1916, in response to Senate resolution No. 544, Sixty-third Congress, be printed as a Senate document, together with accompanying tables and illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before unanimous consent is given I desire to call the attention of the Senate to certain public documents that have been printed covering the subject matter of this report.

In the first place, I wish to say that it will cost the Government for printing this document some twenty-odd thousand dollars. The information it contains, which is claimed will be used in the discussion of the water-power bill, has been printed many times, either in this body or in the House of Representatives; volume after volume has been printed and reprinted.

I noticed in the Evening Star of January 26, 1916, the following statement:

Gifford Pinchot, president of the National Conservation Association, who is in New York, has made public through the Washington office of the association in the Munsey Building a statement drawing attention to the report on water power made to the Senate by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Pinchot says that the report, which charges that a monopoly of control of water powers and water-power sites exists in the United States, establishes every contention as to the water-power situation made by the conservation association.

"On January 20," Mr. Pinchot says in his statement, "Secretary Houston's report was referred to the Senate Committee on Printing."

"There is grave danger that its publication will be held up until too late to affect legislation now before Congress. The revelations of the report as to the growth of monopoly in water power and the facts as to development are so damaging to the water-power interests that serious efforts will be made to smother it."

Now, Mr. President, what are the facts in relation to this matter?

On January 20, 1916, the Senate referred the report to the Committee on Printing.

On January 21, 1916, the report was received by the committee from the Secretary of the Senate.

On January 21, 1916, the report was referred to the Public Printer for an estimate, as required by law. The committee could not act upon it until it had that estimate.

On January 25, 1916, there was a meeting of the committee called to consider printing the report, but it was postponed until January 28, as a quorum could not attend. Furthermore, the Public Printer had not completed his estimate as to the cost of printing the report, and it was not in the possession of the committee.

On January 27, 1916, the estimate was received from the Public Printer. The delay in submitting the estimate was due to the fact that the report contains 220 lithographic plates, on which the Public Printer had to obtain quotations from private contractors before completing the estimate.

On January 28, 1916, a meeting of the committee was called for 10 a. m. to consider the printing of the report.

This morning, Mr. President, a report was made by the chairman of the committee and unanimous consent is asked that the report be printed.

I call this to the attention of the Senate owing to the fact that this same bulldozing method has been going on for years from this same source whenever one of their pet schemes is before Congress, and I think the public ought to know it, Mr. President.

As far as I am concerned, if the Government of the United States wants to virtually throw \$21,000 away, let us order the report printed; but when I stop to consider that volume after volume has been printed upon this same subject, with cuts and diagrams and all the information that will ever be referred to in the consideration of the water-power bill, not printed once but has been printed many times—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I suppose the Senator refers to the official publications upon the subject. Is it not also true that this same information has been printed on many occasions in magazines and newspapers of the country?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, of course; but what I am speaking of now are official documents paid for by the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. But I wanted to emphasize another side of the situation, so that the Senate might understand that this information has been given to the public from private and official sources time after time within the last five or six years.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question about it, Mr. President.

In this connection I wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Pinchot bases his fear of the report not being printed upon the statement that the men who are opposed to conservation will prevent it. There is no basis of fact for this fear. The power bill is not conservation legislation, but legislation which robs the State of its water and gives the control of it into the hands of a bureau here at Washington. Mr. Pinchot claims that those opposed to the passage of the power bill are fearful that the information contained in this report, if printed, would show the power companies and water-power sites of the country in the hands of a monopoly, and, if so, their whole contention would be swept aside.

Mr. President, I wish to say that it is conceded by those who have studied the question and know the nature of the business that the most efficient and cheapest service can be rendered the people of any community or of any State by the concentration of small powers into one great unit. It is impossible to serve a community or a State or States, for that matter, and have a large number of small, insignificant units of power. But everyone, Mr. President, admits that when this great unit is established it should be controlled by the public utility commission of the State in which the plant is located. The price of power must be and is controlled; the distribution of power is and must be controlled by these commissions. Laws in virtually all the States have been—and, no doubt, will be—passed for this purpose, and there can be no harm come to the people of the United States in having electric energy centered in great power companies that can furnish service efficiently, cheaply, and promptly, but under the supervision of the commissions of the States.

Mr. President, I wish to insert as a part of my remarks an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 22, 1916, upon this very question. It is short:

"CONTROL" OF WATER POWER—A CONTROL WHICH PREVENTS UTILIZATION IS NOT TO BE DESIRED.

The Secretary of Agriculture is one of the members of the President's Cabinet who is reputed to possess intellectual strength. He certainly

does not, and presumably can not escape from the blighting influence of the university environment from which he was taken and which incapacitates all who are long subjected to it for any useful service in the direction of affairs.

In his report on the water power of the Nation Secretary Houston shows his university-bred fear of "monopoly" of water power in his comment on the situation, which he finds to be that more than half the water power now utilized is in control of 18 corporations and one-quarter in the control of 6.

The fact is that all sources of water power which can be united by connecting wires ought to be united and under single control. In no other way can temporary deficiencies in one section be so promptly and economically supplemented from surpluses in other sections.

If unbelievers are not satisfied with the authority of the Chronicle and their own common sense, we respectfully refer them to Gifford Pinchot, whose authority no uplifter will deny, and who is a sturdy supporter of this view of the case.

But Secretary Houston, who, had he developed in a more favorable environment, would have quite probably become a vigorous man of affairs, quakes and shudders at the university-created bogie of "monopoly."

An unrestrained monopoly of a necessity would, of course, suck the lifeblood out of any community which it could get at; but when the price of service is fixed by the people served, the situation is reversed, and the danger is that the community will suck the lifeblood out of the monopolies.

Which is, in fact, the danger which threatens the American monopolies to-day.

As, however, the votes of the ignorant greatly outnumber the votes of the wise, Congress legislates to placate ignorance rather than wisdom, with the inevitable result. Ignoring the national obligation to the States, it has so legislated that no new hydroelectric power whatever is being developed on the public domain, and the monopolists which so terrify Secretary Houston are thereby protected in their monopoly—such as it is.

As this result is now too obvious to be ignored, even by university professors and Congressmen, a new law is being engineered through Congress intended to make it possible to conserve some of our coal and oil by the substitution of hydroelectric power. Whether it will have that result will only be known when possible investors have studied the bill as finally passed.

If development follows, even on a trifling scale, the administration will shout that it has unlocked the sources of hydroelectric power, trusting that the people will forget that there would have been no occasion for unlocking if the same people had not previously locked, barred, and barricaded the same sources which they now ask credit for turning loose.

I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that Mr. Gifford Pinchot has admitted that public-service corporations for the distribution of electric power are more effective and can give better and cheaper power to the people in a single large unit than in many small ones, but that it ought to be regulated by some power other than its own officers no one disputes.

Mr. President, there are a mass of illustrations, 220 of them, in this report that will have to be lithographed. The cost of printing as provided in the committee report is over \$20,000. This is only for a limited number of copies, 1,345 in all, and under the law the printed report will have to go first, 220 to the Senate, 350 to the House, 500 to depository libraries of the United States, and balance to departments, and so forth. The distribution gives each Senator two and hardly one to each Representative in Congress.

I warn you if this is ordered printed it will be only the beginning of the expense to the Government of the United States.

However, I wish to say if the printing of the report would assist any Senator in determining how his vote should be cast upon the water-power bill, I would not say one word about the expense. Not one change in the bill will be made by the printing of the report.

Now, Mr. President, I shall say no more. I shall not interpose an objection at this time to the present consideration of the resolution. If the Senate wants to vote for the expenditure of money in this way, well and good; I have done my duty in calling the attention of the Senate to it. I want the Senate to vote upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question before that is put. What is the estimate of the cost of the publication of this report without the illustrations?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not an estimate of the cost without the illustrations.

There is this about it, I will say to the Senator. This report was made by the Secretary of Agriculture, but it was the work of the Forest Service, the chief engineer, Mr. Merrill, having compiled it, as he had done the work of collecting the data in pursuance of a resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] last year. There have been some six or eight months' hard work put upon the preparation of the data. It probably cost the department twice as much as \$20,000 in actual expense. It is regarded as the most complete compilation of data on the subject of water-power development throughout the whole country, covering all the United States, that has ever been gotten together. The report is made in pursuance of that reso-

lution calling upon the Department of Agriculture to collect the data and perform this service and make these estimates and furnish the information to Congress.

The report was referred to the Committee on Printing, as the Senator from Utah very properly has said, on the 20th of this month. There has been no delay, and there has been no excuse for anyone to suggest a criticism of delay in action on the part of the committee or anyone else, because as fast as we could we obtained what it was required by the law that we should obtain, an estimate of the cost, before we made a report upon the resolution. That estimate came in but a day or so ago, and this morning I have been authorized by the committee to make this report.

The estimated cost is \$20,903.06. That includes, of course—and there was a delay perhaps of a day in getting that estimate, because we had to call upon outside parties to make the estimate on the lithographic work, which the Public Printer himself did not have in hand—the maps and drawings, some of which are colored, but they are an important part of the report. I would not think it advisable to print this report without those, because they explain and illustrate it. To print the volume of typewritten material I should think would not probably cost over one-tenth that amount, or somewhere in that neighborhood.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I have no doubt the committee has acted very promptly in the matter, and I should like very much for the report to be printed were it not for the fact that the illustrations are so costly. If the illustrations are to cost \$18,000 and the printed matter is to cost but \$2,000, I very much doubt the expediency of publishing both. I should be glad, however, to have all the typewritten matter published.

Mr. FLETCHER. I can not say that that difference would exist. I have not the material before me for separating the estimate. The estimate furnished to the committee was that the cost would be \$20,903.06 to print the material as a public document, which would give about 1,345 copies, as I recall.

It is a very important document; there is nothing more important to this country, in my judgment, than the proper development of that great resource—the water power of the country. This covers the whole United States, the information has been carefully gathered, at enormous expense and outlay of time and effort, and I think the report ought to be printed.

Mr. STONE. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] a moment ago stated that substantially all the matter embraced in this proposed print had already been published. I should like to know whether the Senator from Florida agrees to that statement?

Mr. FLETCHER. No.

Mr. STONE. If it be true, what is the need of multiplying these publications, at very great expense?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Utah is in error about that, I am quite sure. There were hearings before the Public Lands Committee in 1914, I think, and some of those hearings were printed as late as two years ago; but I am sure that this material is not embodied in those hearings. I am quite positive that the material here offered to be printed is down to date, is new, and while, of course, the hearings may have in a general way gone into this question, by no means has this material ever before been printed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say in answer to the Senator from Florida with reference—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to ask a question. Who is recognized, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized nobody, as for a good long time the Senate has been taking charge of itself. The Chair will, however, ask the Senator from Florida whether he will yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thought the Senator from Florida had concluded, and I desired to be heard for a moment on this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator desires to interrupt, I am perfectly willing to have him proceed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thought the Senator had finished, and I desired to be heard for a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The colloquy was going on, and the Chair was not interfering.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply desire to correct the statement made by the Senator from Florida, based upon the question asked by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE].

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am interested in this proposition, and I can not hear the debate.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Missouri asked a question as to whether practically all of the information contained in the report now proposed to be printed had not already been printed, basing that question upon a statement that I had made.

I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that the illustrations have not been printed. All, no doubt, will remember that when that report was presented to the Senate there was a stack of illustrations at least 1 foot high and, I should judge, 2 feet wide and about 2 feet 6 inches long. This is what I did say: That every question that is involved in the passage of the so-called Ferris power bill that is now upon the Senate Calendar has been discussed before the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate and also before the committee of the House of Representatives. I have in my hand one of the three volumes of the hearings that were held one year ago, where every phase of the present bill now on the calendar was discussed; and the hearings are to-day in printed form.

Not only that, Mr. President, but any Senator who will take the volumes and look through them will find illustrations as to many of the contested points. I do not want it understood, however, that the published reports of the proceedings of the committee contain all the vast number of illustrations submitted with this report. There are 220 of them, and the Government Printing Office had to send out for bids for the lithographing of those exhibits before it could submit the estimated cost of the report.

I want to say that so far as the information is concerned that is contained in the report, if it had not been printed before, by all means print it; I would not hesitate a moment to advocate doing so. My only contention is, that so long as we have this information, and all that will ever be referred to in the consideration of the power bill which is now upon the calendar, and all that has been referred to by Mr. Pinchot not only in this body, but in the other House as well, it seems to me like a useless expenditure of public money to now print this report with the illustrations.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am quite sure that, although there have been hearings, as the Senator from Utah has stated, there are diagrams, drawings, illustrations, maps, plats, and other data collected and submitted with this report, which constitute a very important part of it; and without them, mere statements such as would be brought out in hearings would not properly give the information as to what is contained in this report.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator a question before he leaves the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it not true that this report comes before the Senate in answer to a resolution passed by the Senate?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have just so stated.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not hear the Senator, and I have come over on his side of the Chamber in order that I might hear him. If I have the right idea, this report comes before us now because we ordered the work which it embodies to be done and the facts contained in it to be gathered?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. NORRIS. And those facts and that information were gathered in pursuance of our order; they are ready to be published; and unless they are published, we can get no benefit from the research and work that has been done up to this time?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Nebraska is entirely right; and, as I have already said, it has cost the Government to gather the data and information contained in the report many times more than the printing will cost. I think it is very important to print it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word. If I remember correctly, this report was made in response to a resolution which I had the honor to submit to the Senate, and I judge it contains a great deal of very important information. I do not construe the information which it contains as it has been construed by others, but I am satisfied that it contains information which would be interesting to those who may wish to discuss this question from any standpoint.

I am not able to confirm what has been said by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that all this information is to be found elsewhere, because I have not had time to look fully into this report, as I have been endeavoring to do, but, from conversa-

tions which I have had with those who seem to know its contents, I think it a very valuable report. Does any Senator know about what it will cost to print it?

Mr. SMOOT. It will cost \$21,000 to print it as a public document providing for 1,345 copies, of which 220 will go to the Senate, 350 to the House, and 500 to depository libraries of the country. There will be two for each Senator and nearly one for each Member of the House.

Mr. FLETCHER. I find, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to answer that question and also the question submitted by the Senator from Colorado, which I was unable to answer a moment ago, that the cost of printing the text without the illustrations, plats, maps, and so forth, will be \$7,832.24. The total cost of printing the whole thing—and the illustrations are so involved with the text as to make it almost useless to print the text without the illustrations—will be \$20,903.06.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the amount which has been suggested seems a large one to incur in the printing of a document, but the subject with which we are dealing involves not only thousands, but hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars; and, in addition to that, in my judgment, it involves other questions of more moment to this country than the mere question of dollars and cents. I am very anxious myself to have the information that this report is supposed to contain. There can be no exaggeration as to the importance of the subject with which we are soon to deal and concerning which this report is made, and I feel that this information ought to be at our disposal.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the printing of the illustrations constitutes almost two-thirds of the total cost. I have never seen any great information derived from illustrations. It seems to me that if we could print the text and omit the illustrations we would get all the information that is desired and save the Government about \$13,000 or \$14,000.

What I was inquiring of the Senator from Florida was whether or not that could not be done and what amount of saving it would involve. As I have said, people do not acquire information to any great extent from illustrations, unless they contemplate construction work; but if they simply desire to get information on the subject intended to be covered by the resolution, namely, the desirability or undesirability of enacting the kind of legislation proposed, it seems to me it would be well to omit the illustrations and thereby save the Government that amount of money.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Florida that, so far as I am personally concerned, if the report is to be printed, it ought to be printed with the illustrations, and for this reason: The substance of the report—that is, the testimony—has already been printed time and time again, but it has not been printed with all of the illustrations.

This information, Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Idaho and also to the Senator from Florida, was not collected in answer to the resolution of the Senator from Idaho. The information was all collected before the resolution was introduced; and, of course, all the expense incurred by the Government in the collection of the material was incurred before the resolution was introduced. I will further say to the Senator that I know that to be true, because we had the subject before the Public Lands Committee, and Mr. Merrill, who collected the information, appeared before the committee day after day and had the information to submit to the committee at that time.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there is one thing I want to say, namely, that I am not afraid of this report—

Mr. SMOOT. Nor am I.

Mr. BORAH. Because of the fact that it establishes the existence of a monopoly. If that fact is established, I want to make further inquiry as to why it is permitted to continue; and I shall be able to demonstrate, to my satisfaction at least, that this present bill will not discontinue it. I think it is worth while for us to know all that can be known about this subject. If there is a monopoly of water-power sites and of water development, and this report proves it, we shall be ready to call upon some one to proceed to get rid of this monopoly, if it is monopoly we fear. There has been much said by the advocates of the Ferris bill that one of its virtues is to prevent monopoly. There is a more effective way to get rid of monopoly, if it exists, and I want to know some of the present conditions as to monopoly.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. I thought the Senator was through, but perhaps he will let me interrupt him long enough to say further that I have a letter from the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands of the House, Mr. SCOTT FERRIS, in which he says:

As you doubtless recall, Senator BORAH introduced a resolution last year calling for the compilation of certain data with reference to water-power development.

Mr. O. C. Merrill, chief engineer, Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, has made a compilation which, to my mind, is the greatest thing ever had on the subject. He was good enough to let us have part of the data to help us in handling our water-power legislation in the House, and everyone who has observed it all is delighted with it.

I want to urge you, if I may, to have the data printed.

Then he proceeds to specify that he would like to have the text of the report at once for use, the other portion to follow. That is the request coming from the other body as to the printing of this material; and, without going into the question of legislation on the subject at all, it is simply a question about what we will do with this report. I do not know how far we may have to go in connection with legislation.

Mr. BORAH. I think the report ought to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not know that I would object to the publication of the report if the illustrations were excluded. At the same time, so far as I can estimate its worth from what has been said about it, it seems to me its purpose is to establish what I think every man who has given much attention to the subject knows to be the fact, and that is the existence of a monopoly in the water-power development of the country. That such a monopoly exists is, in my judgment, beyond all question. The subject matter of the business is a natural monopoly, and, that being so, in my judgment, in view of material and industrial conditions, we might as well try to interfere with the operation of the law of gravitation as to interfere with the law of monopoly as applying to such a great subject as the question of the development and distribution of hydroelectric power. It is here; it has been here for a long time; and all the reports on earth, I do not think, will change that fact, nor will any legislation such as has been proposed affect it very much, if at all. So long as the business is permitted to be a private one—that is to say, one which is developed, owned, and operated by private interests—just so long the monopoly will continue.

The action of the Government in the proposed water-power bill, instead of interfering with, preventing, modifying, or destroying existing conditions, will simply add to them. The only possible remedy—and I think the public will realize it at some time—is in the public ownership of the development and distribution of electric power.

I do not think it requires a lot of illustrations to demonstrate the existence of the conditions to which the report pertains; but, at the same time, if it is desired by the Senate to print it, I am perfectly willing to see it done, provided that the illustrations, which seem to me entirely beside the purpose, are eliminated. I can not conceive what purpose the illustrations can subserve, except to secure, perhaps, a wider distribution of the document. A great many books in these days which are not worth printing receive quite a circulation because of the fact that they are handsomely illustrated. We are illustrating too many of these reports. So far as one particular report is concerned, the expense to the Government is comparatively nominal, but when duplicated and reduplicated and multiplied time after time, as is always the case when precedents are set, we are rapidly reaching the time when reports and documents published by official authority will be more attractive and perhaps more useful by reason of the illustrations they contain than by reason of the printed matter they contain.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I think the report ought to be printed, so that we can see what it contains. Undoubtedly the substantive part of it would be as valuable without the illustrations as it would be with the illustrations. It might not be as interesting, but perhaps it would be as valuable.

The admitted existence of a national water-power monopoly does not remove the difficulty of deciding the form of legislation in regard to further grants of water powers. Suppose there is a national monopoly; the methods of its formation and control, to what extent it has developed power already in private hands will all be elucidated by this report.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to say that these illustrations are not pictures? They are maps and drawings and plans, which are so connected with the text that it would not be understood without the illustrations. They are not merely photographic pictures.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, we can not pass any judgment upon the comparative value of the illustrations until we see them, and, not being printed, we have no practical oppor-

tunity to see them; but I should like to ask the Senator upon what he bases his estimate of the cost of this publication.

Mr. FLETCHER. The law requires the committee to obtain an estimate of the cost, and that is done through the Public Printer. The Public Printer has been obliged to get estimates outside of his office, because some of this work can not be done in his office; and the estimate we have is furnished to us by the Public Printer. He has made the inquiry and obtained the information.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Has the Senator any estimate of the cost of printing that part of the report, outside of the illustrations?

Mr. FLETCHER. We have estimates as to both and as to all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I simply wanted to ask the Senator from Florida a question. I should like to ask him if he has any information or any estimate as to the time that would be required to get out this publication with these illustrations—how long it would take?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no definite information as to that. Of course, the text can be printed within a very short time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not asking about the text. I have an idea about that. What I should like to know, Mr. President, is about how long it would take to publish this document with the illustrations included? I have had some experience along that line, and I have an idea that it will not be completed until three or four or perhaps five months, when all the legislation intended to be affected by it will have passed, if it should be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. FLETCHER. My information is that all of it can be done inside of a month.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How does the Senator get that information? From the department?

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Printing Office.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I have noticed a great number of reports in which the maps were printed in a separate volume from the text of the report and could be considered as a separate proposition. When we see the text of the report we can then determine with some degree of intelligence the importance of the maps and appendices, and for that purpose, if for no other reason, that portion of the report ought to be printed.

Now, as to the cost of this. I suppose the Senator estimates the salaries of the employees in the Printing Office, the cost of maintaining the Printing Office, and so forth. All of that is an overhead charge which goes on just the same, whether this report is printed or not.

So far as the existence of a monopoly is concerned, and whether or not this report shows the existence of a monopoly, the question which will have to be determined in the passage of water-power legislation is what we are going to do about it if it is admitted that there is such a monopoly, whether or not the Federal Government is going to reserve some regulative control over the combination. There is an intermediate ground before we reach Government ownership. We are not necessarily going in one step to Government development and ownership of water power, which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] says is the only alternative to private monopoly. That is a question that is involved in the bill which is coming up when the Philippine bill is disposed of.

This report undoubtedly is the result of a considerable expenditure of money in obtaining the facts which compose it, and it is perfectly useless unless it is printed. I have seen in the Literary Digest, for instance, advertisements of the General Electric Co., advertising for sale electric power in Spokane, Wash.; in Baltimore, Md.; in Washington, D. C.; and in every important city in the United States and Canada. That is conclusive proof of the existence of some central control over this kind of power. But the mere admission of this does not solve the problem. There are other questions to be decided, and the detailed information and conclusions contained in this report will throw light upon them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I hope this report will be printed. The Senate on this occasion, as it has been on a number of other occasions, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. Here is a report which is made pursuant to a resolution heretofore adopted by the Senate that will cost the Government something like \$20,000. The procurement of the information has cost more; and yet, as has been said by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], it involves a subject that is worth

millions of dollars, and I may say billions of dollars, to this country; and we hesitate now to print the data that have been secured and that can be made available and used when we come to the consideration of the Ferris bill and other measures affecting water power.

A water-power conference was held in my city a few months ago. That conference adopted a set of resolutions in opposition to the so-called Ferris bill. There were differences of opinion amongst the distinguished gentlemen who attended that conference with reference to Federal control of water-power sites and those who favored the acquisition of these power sites by the States and their control by the States under the jurisdiction of public utilities commissions. Notwithstanding the adoption of those resolutions at the water-power conference referred to in opposition to the Ferris bill or anything like it, or anything like Federal control, the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate and the Committee on the Public Lands of the House have reported out practically all that has been insisted upon with reference to Federal control of water-power sites.

That is the question involved. It is one that is going to be discussed here for weeks and months before it is finally disposed of and the issue settled. I assume that the gentlemen who oppose Federal control, like the distinguished Senator from Utah and others whom I might name, want information on this subject, and all that can be availed of. This report gives it all in such form that it is easily accessible to the Members of the Senate and those who are interested in the subject.

It is true, as the Senator from Utah has said, that much of this information has been printed from time to time, but it is scattered through hundreds of different printed reports and hearings, and it is physically impossible ever to collate it so that the Senate can have the benefit of the views of officials of the Government when we come to consider the bills on the subject. This report puts it all in such shape that the Senate can get access to the information in abbreviated form, if that be possible. The Senator from Utah would say it was not in abbreviated form, but it is, because the subject is discussed in thousands of volumes, and there are as many views of it as it is possible to find views on any subject of interest to the people of this country.

Mr. President, with reference to the question of monopoly I agree with the Senator from Idaho. If this report establishes that the water powers of this country have been monopolized, then either the Government itself has been derelict in its duty in not dissolving the monopolies or it ought to be possible for the Congress of the United States, in the light which will be furnished by these reports, to find some method of controlling them. It is the last natural resource that the people have, the last that has not been disposed of and has not been monopolized in its entirety.

It is to protect the water powers of this country that it is insisted that this report ought to be printed, no matter what it costs, so that the Senate may determine for itself whether or not there is a monopoly, whether or not the Government has been derelict in its duty, and lastly, whether or not, if it has been derelict in its duty, the Congress of the United States can not do its duty and find some method for the control of this power.

I hope the Senate is not going to balk at the expenditure of \$20,000 to print a report, with the illustrations that accompany it, when there is involved in it so much money, and not only so much money but so much of interest to present and to future generations.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. In looking over the report of the hearings before the Committee on Public Lands, which I hold in my hand, I notice an illustration of the Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Railway. "Silver Bow Canyon: Freight train, 22 cars; total weight, 1,200 tons; two 80-ton electric locomotives." Is that necessary to give any information?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Oh, you can not say what is necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Well, wait; let us take another. We have another of the same kind.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; you can pick out things—

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Oh, yes; but if the Senator will permit me, you might put in any picture you pleased. We are not issuing an illustrated magazine. I am in favor of printing this report. I am agreeing with the Senator; but I do not want these things put in the report that are very expensive and are of no possible value to anybody on earth.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, there is not any question but that there may be material in these reports that would be useless.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to say that in the proposed report there are no photographs at all? Those data do not go in this report. They are not a part of the report. There are no photographs at all in it.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; there are. I do not want the Senator to make such a broad statement as that, because I will say that, while most of the illustrations are maps and diagrams, I am quite sure that the Senator, if he will look through, will find a few photographs.

Mr. SHAFROTH. What kind of diagrams and maps are they, please?

Mr. SMOOT. I will answer the Senator from Colorado just as soon as the Senator from Oregon concludes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I should like to know who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is trusting the Senator from Oregon to take care of himself.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to being interrupted, but I object a little to the general conversation on the outside while I am trying to say something to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is not any question, Mr. President, but that some illustrations and some photographs have been printed in the past, and some may be printed in this report, that are of little, if any, value; but they are a small proportion of the whole in the very nature of things. It is a little bit singular—and I mean no disrespect to my colleagues when I say it—that the gentlemen who oppose the Ferris bill or any sort of Federal control are the gentlemen on the floor of the Senate who are objecting to the printing of this report.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to get me mixed up with those who favor the Ferris bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator from Idaho is not opposing the printing of the report?

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that I am not making any charges, Mr. President; but it is a fact that the gentlemen who are opposing the printing of this report are the gentlemen who have stood in opposition to any kind of Federal control.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will not the Senator supplement that statement by saying that Senators who are opposed to the Ferris bill also are in favor of printing the report?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have not heard of any of them yet. I hope they are.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I was one of them, Mr. President.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator from Wyoming certainly is in favor of getting all the information that it is possible to secure. He has no fear of any information coming before the Senate or elsewhere. So I hope the Senator will not go into the merits of the Ferris bill and impute to the opponents of the bill the motive of wishing to suppress information.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am glad to know that some of the Senators who oppose the Ferris bill are favorable to printing this report.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. So far as I am personally concerned, Mr. President, the only reason why I even suggested that the report be not printed was from the fact that all of the information contained in the report, with the exception of some of the diagrams, is in print at present, and has been for the last four or five years, and I thought it was a duplication of printing.

If the Senator will yield for just a moment further, I want to say to the Senate that if this report is to be printed I hope all of it will be printed. I do not believe it would be right to print just the text of the report and let the diagrams go out.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. I am one of the Members of this body who is opposed to what is called the Government leasing of its domain

or any part of it. Now, it may be that that has something to do with my opposition to the publication of this report. I think, however, that the Senator can be charitable enough to assume, at least, that some of those who desire to have the report printed are actuated quite as much by their friendship for Government leasing measures as those who, from a sense of duty, are opposed to Government leasing measures.

So far as I am concerned, my objection is based on the fact that this is a proposed expenditure for what seems to me to be a wholly useless purpose. If the monopoly exists, it is not necessary to illustrate it by diagrams.

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. THOMAS. If it does not exist, diagrams will not establish that fact. Why should we expend for these, to my mind, useless illustrations thousands of dollars of the public money, especially when most of them have been published in other reports and at other times?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I want to disclaim any purpose to question the motives of any Senator. I simply call attention to the fact; that is all. I attribute to them the same purity of purpose and intent as I claim for myself. I simply call attention to that particular fact.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] continues to reiterate the statement that this matter has all been published in other documents. Assuming that some of it has been published, it has been so published that it is impossible of study by the Senate of the United States as a consecutive whole.

I have been a member of the Public Lands Committee for a good many years. A witness will come in to the committee room, Mr. Merrill, for instance. There are three or four members of the committee present, and they proceed to interrogate him and disturb his line of thought. When they have exhausted themselves three or four other members of the committee will come in and exhaust themselves, covering parts of the same subject. When the witness gets through no man can sit down and intelligently arrive at a conclusion as to what the witness meant. That is the way it is done, and this matter is scattered through various tomes filled with this and other subjects.

I hope this matter may be printed and brought before the Senate in answer to the resolution adopted here, so that the Senate may have before them when they consider the bill all the information. I wish to say to the Senate now that that bill is not going to be disposed of in a day. Some one wanted to know how long it would take to print this report. It does not make any difference if it takes three months; the bill will probably be pending before the Senate at that time, and it may not go through at all. I hope the Senate will print the report.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am one of those who are very strenuously opposing the so-called Ferris bill. That is no reason, however, why I should object to the printing of this report. I think the Senate ought to be thoroughly educated on this subject, and when it is and the whole matter is thoroughly understood I think the Ferris bill will be defeated. I regard it as one of the most important cases of proposed legislation that will come before the Senate at the present session. It involves an entire change of the policy of the Government in dealing with its public lands. It will amount to an infringement upon the rights of the States to deal with the flow and use of the waters within the States. That is an exceedingly serious question.

I think, Mr. President, we ought to get all the information we can upon a matter as important as that, and I certainly do not object to the publication of this report if it is going to give us any information that will help us to reach right conclusions upon that question.

So far as the question of monopoly is concerned, Mr. President, of course these streams are being controlled by monopolies all over the country. Everyone knows that. The Government has been dealing with these monopolies in disposing of the public lands for purposes of that kind, and it will continue to do so even if the Ferris bill is passed. In fact, the Ferris bill has no tendencies, in my judgment, to dissolve monopolies or to hinder their operations in the future. The Ferris bill does not involve the question of monopolies, in my judgment, at all.

So this information will be of little profit, so far as the Ferris bill is concerned, respecting that particular matter; but believing that we should get all the information we can on this subject I am quite favorable to the motion to have the report printed. I am afraid it will be read by very few Senators, and probably no one else will read it, but that does not seem to be an objection to the printing of matter by Congress. Some one may get some information of value out of the report, and therefore it is proper the Senate should print it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should like to say a word, if this discussion is going to continue, as I offered the resolution which seems to have brought forth this report. At the time the

resolution was offered there was a propaganda going on throughout the country to the effect that the Ferris bill was designed and intended to destroy a monopoly of water-power business. I felt that I should like to know what information there was at hand with reference to the existence of a monopoly and with reference to the relationship of some of those who are much in favor of the Ferris bill in reference to those monopolies. I therefore introduced the resolution. I am opposed to the Ferris bill as it is now written.

I merely wished to say this in order that there might not be a misunderstanding as to my position with reference to the Ferris bill and also with reference to publishing the report.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I rose merely to say to the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] has given notice that upon the conclusion of the bill now under consideration, the Philippine bill, he will move to take up the bill on which a report was made by the Committee on Commerce. It deals with dams across navigable streams, and that will involve the consideration, in all probability, of all these questions. Some of us believe that no other legislation coming before Congress transcends in public importance that measure and the other measure dealing with water power, and I most sincerely hope that it will be taken up at the conclusion of the consideration of the Philippine bill.

I gathered, from what the Senator said, that it will be impossible to get this report out for use in connection with the consideration of that measure if it should come up at the time that has now been suggested. I hope we shall not meet any objection to the consideration of that bill at that time upon the ground that this particular report is not then before the body. I trust that it is not intended to postpone the consideration of those important measures to await the printing of this report.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I do not rise as opposing or defending the motion. I really do not know enough about the matter to vote for or against it; but it is a question which, it seems to me, ought to be decided before the measure to which it relates is considered. I gather from what has been said here this morning that in all human probability the expenditure of this \$20,000 will not in any way affect the water-power question. The Senator from Florida states that his information is to the effect that it will take at least a month. Does anyone expect to spend a month waiting for the illustrations in the printed report? Does anyone expect to spend a month upon the consideration of the water-power bill?

The Senator seems to have great faith in this report and its effect upon Members of this body. As far as my experience goes, I am convinced that the illustrations which appear in that report will not change the views of a single Senator here with reference to the existence or nonexistence of a monopoly. I think our experience in other cases will show that such a question will not be decided by illustrations appearing in publications. I have yet to see an instance where a Senator had changed his mind by what was found in illustrations.

This is a considerable item. I do not suppose there is any severer criticism leveled against this body or the other body with reference to the wasteful expenditures of public money than grows out of the continual attempt to publish reports of one sort or another. Sometimes they are obviously and palpably useless; sometimes they are of doubtful utility.

It would seem to me that we have such a case here. We are asked to spend \$21,000 for the publication of a report. As I gather the situation from the statements which have been made here, the report does not come in answer to the resolution of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], but it simply collates information that was in existence and had been gathered by the Government long before the Senator from Idaho tendered his resolution. That is my understanding of it. It is true that the Senator from Idaho offered a resolution, and in response to that resolution these illustrations and this text appear, but the information was in the possession of various agents and officers of the Government long before. It had been laid before the Public Lands Committee of the Senate, had been printed in their hearings, had been laid before the corresponding committee on the other side, and had been printed in their hearings, and, I understand, is easy of access to any man who is sufficiently interested in the subject.

It seems to me to be rather a doubtful proposition that we shall spend \$21,000 to gather up in convenient form this information. Students and advocates of it who have sufficient interest in the subject will go to the various publications and obtain the information they want. There is no trouble about that. Other Members who are not interested in the subject will not read it, no matter how beautiful the illustrations may be.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HUGHES. With pleasure.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Can the Senator from New Jersey refer to any document or source of information showing what proportion of water-power sites in the United States is in private ownership and giving the names of the companies and corporations that own and control them?

Mr. HUGHES. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show it. The Senator from Washington said a while ago that the water power of the country is under the control of the Hydro-Electric Co., and that it was advertising the sale of hydroelectric power in Washington, Baltimore, and various cities of the country. That is probably true. I have no doubt the Senator would not say that if it was not true. The Senator is convinced; that fact of itself is sufficient to demonstrate something; and all the illustrations the committees can lay before him will not change his mind about it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I do not think it will change the mind of the Senator from New Jersey either, but that is an entirely different question from the one I asked the Senator. That is only one phase of this resolution. One question that will come up in the consideration of the bill is that it is urged by a great many people that the water powers ought to be developed and that if a liberal law is passed, when the Government relinquishes all the power of regulation to private companies private companies will invest their capital in these water-power sites and develop them, and it will add to the prosperity of the country. It would be quite interesting to know in that connection what proportion of the water-power sites have already passed out of the hands of the Government and are in the hands of private companies without any reserved power of control or regulation by the Government. Also, it would be interesting to know what proportion of those privately held have been developed.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] informs me that he can give the Senator that information in present publications already paid for by the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield—

Mr. HUGHES. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. The question asked by the Senator from Washington can be answered in detail not only as to the horsepower that is owned by every company but as to the director of every company, and not only the director of every company, but showing in how many companies each individual director is, if in any other power company of the United States, and diagrams showing the interlocking directorates of the different companies. All have been printed before, as I stated.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Utah speaks out of the abundance of his knowledge on this subject. He is a member of the Committee on Public Lands, as I was at one time. I am no longer a member of the committee, but I attended a great many of the hearings, and I know there must be a great pile of data in the possession of that committee already printed. I can not think of any possible thing in connection with this whole question that is not now in print. What I am trying to do is to save the Government the useless expenditure of \$21,000.

Mr. President, I should like to ask what is the parliamentary status? Is there a motion pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no motion pending. The Chair has not yet had an opportunity to ask the Senate whether it gives unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. The Chair has been trying to ask that for an hour. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. HUGHES. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It goes to the calendar. Reports of committees are in order.

ASSISTANT APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (S. 2730) to fix the compensation of assistant appraisers of merchandise, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 96) thereon.

GEORGE H. HERVEY.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 3344) to authorize George H. Hervey, of Pensacola, Fla., to construct and operate an electric railway line on the Fort Barrancas Military Reservation, Fla., and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 95) thereon.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in the Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, in line 6, after the word "military," to strike out "reservation" and insert "reservations," and in the same line, after the words "Fort Barrancas," to insert "and Fort McRee," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the United States is hereby given to George H. Hervey, of Pensacola, Fla., to locate, construct, maintain, and operate a line of electric railway on the military reservations of Fort Barrancas and Fort McRee, in Escambia County, State of Florida, upon such location and under such regulations and conditions as shall be approved by the Secretary of War.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize George H. Hervey, of Pensacola, Fla., to construct and operate an electric railway line on the Fort Barrancas and Fort McRee Military Reservations, Fla., and for other purposes."

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 85, to authorize the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico to employ a stenographer to take testimony, etc., reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 4059) authorizing suits to be brought by any State or States against the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 4060) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 4061) providing for the refund of duties collected on hot-rolled flat-steel wire rods, about 3 inches in width and one-eighth of an inch in thickness, under the act of Congress approved June 24, 1897, and under the act of Congress approved August 5, 1909, imported subsequently to June 4, 1908, and prior to October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 4062) granting a pension to Harry S. Comrey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 4063) authorizing the replacement of a bridge across the Republican River near Fort Riley, Kans., under the direction of the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 4064) granting a pension to William H. Houston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 4065) for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore; and
A bill (S. 4066) to satisfy the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of William Moseley, administrator of Temperance Moseley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4067) to establish a fish hatchery in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4068) for the relief of Mary E. Boyd (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4069) to protect the dignity and honor of the uniform of the United States; and

A bill (S. 4070) to provide for the utilization of the Forest Service personnel for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 91) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Repre-

sentatives to investigate the conditions relating to the national defense and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, through a joint subcommittee of 10 Senators and 10 Representatives, who shall be selected by said committees, respectively, 5 by each, are hereby appointed to investigate—

(a) The general subject of the national defense.

(b) The efficiency of the present organization of the Army and Navy and the increase of such efficiency.

(c) The advisability of compulsory service.

(d) The relation of the State Militia to the national defense.

(e) The advisability of creating a council of national defense, and its composition.

(f) The increase of the military and naval schools for training officers and utilization for this purpose of the schools of agriculture and mechanic arts created under the Morrill Act.

(g) National cooperation with the States in school training, involving the fundamental idea of the use of arms for the maintenance of civil order, both domestic and international, and not for conquest, and the method to be adopted for the inculcation of such idea.

(h) The construction, equipment, and personnel of auxiliary ships for the Navy to be used in war in aid of the fighting ships and in peace for establishing routes of commerce and mail to foreign countries.

(i) The necessary cost of the national defense covering a period of five years, and including in this the extent and size of such organization of the national defense as will be covered by an annual expenditure of \$300,000,000, \$350,000,000, \$400,000,000, \$450,000,000, and \$500,000,000, respectively, for a period of five years, commencing July 1, 1916, with authority to sit during the recess of Congress and with power to summon witnesses, to appoint necessary experts, clerks, and stenographers, and to do whatever is necessary for a full and comprehensive examination and study of the subject, and report to Congress as expeditiously as may be; that the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as is necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to pay the necessary expenses of the subcommittee and its members, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Said appropriation shall be immediately available and shall be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said subcommittee, which audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of such subcommittee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I would like to make a brief statement in connection with that joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The President has called the attention of Congress to the question of preparedness. There are now four committees, two of the House of Representatives and two of the Senate—the Committees on Military Affairs and the Committees on Naval Affairs—engaged in the consideration of the question of the national defense. Four separate hearings are being had, at which the various witnesses appear in rotation, the same witness appearing before two or more committees. The country is confused with these various hearings; the newspapers themselves are not able to keep track of them, and the country is not being informed of their progress.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to coordinate all four of these committees—the Committees on Military Affairs of both Houses and the Committees on Naval Affairs of both Houses—through a subcommittee to be appointed from each, with a view to having one hearing and making a report, which can be submitted to the respective committees and then action taken upon the subject. My idea is that this will very much expedite the orderly progress of this matter. The national defense is a unit, and the Army and Navy are merely divisions of that unit. They should be considered together and not separately. An increased expense in the one should involve a diminished expense in the other.

I ask that the joint resolution may lie upon the table, in the hope that the chairmen of the committees referred to will favor it, and in the further hope that it may then be immediately adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to make a statement in answer to the last statement which was made by the Senator from Nevada. I understand that this is a joint resolution.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Nevada understands full well that such a resolution can not be immediately considered, but must be referred to a committee. In order that the Senator may be informed, I will say that if he asks for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution I shall object, because, under the rules, a joint resolution has to go to a committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am not asking for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I have asked that it lie on the table. I shall bring it up next Monday, in the hope that the committees will cooperate in the immediate adoption of the resolution. It is a matter for next Monday.

Mr. SMOOT. If the joint resolution is brought up on next Monday it will have to go to a committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the resolution lying on the table? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CENTRAL HEATING, LIGHTING, AND POWER PLANT.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 92) relative to the construction on the site selected of the central heating, lighting, and power plant authorized by the provisions of the sundry civil appropriations act approved June 23, 1913, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That inasmuch as the plans adopted for the construction of the central heating, lighting, and power plant authorized by the provision of the sundry civil appropriations act approved June 23, 1913 (38 Stat. L., p. 25), on the site selected raise serious questions affecting the appearance of the city of Washington and the desirability of erecting said plant according to said plans, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to submit these plans to Congress, together with all reports from commissions, architects, engineers, and others who have been consulted in connection therewith; and that no work upon the construction of said plant shall be commenced until plans therefor shall have been approved by the President of the United States.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. I desire to say that it is very much feared by the Commission of Fine Arts that the erection of the structure referred to in the joint resolution, according to present plans, will be exceedingly unsightly, and that it is quite possible that it may be something of a nuisance. It is proposed to construct this immense heating and lighting plant in the neighborhood of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, near the Mall. I am told that its smokestacks will be four in number and that they will be 195 feet in height. It seems to me very important that we should get the report of the Commission of Fine Arts on this subject, and determine whether or not the height of these smokestacks can not be diminished and the unsightliness of the building modified.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no possible objection to the joint resolution; on the contrary, I sympathize with it; but I think the Senator from Nevada had better make it either a concurrent resolution or a Senate resolution, because under the rules the joint resolution would have to go to a committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I have put this in the form of a joint resolution because it directs the holding up of the construction of this building until the report asked for is made. I assumed that it would have to be a joint resolution in order to do that, as the building is being constructed under an appropriation made in the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. LODGE. Is not that matter covered by the urgent deficiency bill now on our tables? There is a long amendment in that bill in regard to the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. That is an additional amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; that is an additional appropriation.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I simply want an opportunity for the Art Commission to make a thorough inquiry and report upon this subject, with a view to the preservation of the beauty of the Mall.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me suggest to the Senator that he withdraw the joint resolution at this time for the reason that there is an item concerning this building in the urgent deficiency bill, which is now on the calendar. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has already given notice that he intends to ask that that bill be taken up on Monday, and I suggest that the Senator from Nevada might consult with the chairman of that committee before asking for the consideration of the joint resolution. There is, as I have stated, an item contained in the appropriation bill providing for extending the limit of cost of the construction of the plant referred to in the Senator's joint resolution. The plant, as I remember, is to be located at Fourteenth and B Streets. While I am in sympathy with the joint resolution itself, being a member of the Appropriations Committee I should feel obliged, in the absence of the chairman of that committee, to make an objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution, even if it were a Senate resolution. If the Senator from Nevada will take the matter up with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], I think perhaps he can come to some arrangement with him.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to say that this resolution has reference only to furnishing an additional building with heat, to wit, the Red Cross Building and one of the Navy buildings. I think that is the only purpose of the additional appropriation provided for in the bill. It does not affect the location of the plant or the manner of its erection.

Mr. SMOOT. But it affects the size of the plant.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; the size of the plant is affected.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Nevada will permit me, his joint resolution would be in order as an amendment to the urgent deficiency bill on Monday.

Mr. SMOOT. It would go out on a point of order.

Mr. LODGE. It would not go out on a point of order, if the Senator will excuse me. It is not legislation and proposes to make no appropriation; it involves no expense even. It only asks for certain orders to hold up this work.

Mr. OVERMAN. The committee amendment itself would go out on a point of order.

Mr. LODGE. The main amendment of the committee?

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. If the committee reports it, it does not make any difference whether the item is estimated for or not. The joint resolution offered by the Senator from Nevada, unless I am very much mistaken—

Mr. OVERMAN. If it is new legislation, it would go out on a point of order.

Mr. LODGE. It would be entirely in order as an amendment, because it is a mere direction as to the expenditure of an appropriation and asks for certain papers.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator is wrong in his statement. If the committee reports new legislation, is not that subject to a point of order? Suppose our committee should report new legislation?

Mr. LODGE. Of course new general legislation would be subject to a point of order under our rules, but this is not general legislation. The resolution of the Senator from Nevada, as I understand, puts a limitation on an expenditure, and such a proposal has always been held to be in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I agree with the Senator. I merely wanted to correct the statement of the Senator, as I understood him, that anything the committee put on is not subject to a point of order. I will say that there is one exception to that general statement, and that is where new general legislation has been added.

Mr. LODGE. If it is general legislation, certainly. I was not going into that, but this case, I think, does not come under that rule. I feel very sure that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will be glad to take up this matter with the Senator from Nevada, and I think that is the quickest way of reaching the result. The joint resolution, at all events, could lie on the table until Monday and we could see what we could do in connection with the appropriation bill.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well; I will ask that the joint resolution lie on the table until Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$90,000 for the improvement of Sixteenth Street NW., from Montague Street to Alaska Avenue, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ALLOWANCE OF CLAIMS.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 651) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his clerks, announced that the President had on January 28, 1916, approved and signed the following act:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2288. An act for the relief of Thomas R. Mason;

H. R. 4530. An act for the relief of Michael F. O'Hare;

H. R. 5835. An act for the relief of James Stanton;

H. R. 7248. An act for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co.; and

H. R. 8318. An act for the relief of De Barbieri & Co., of Valparaiso, Chile.

H. R. 2180. An act for the relief of Albert Greenlaw was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval

Academy at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask unanimous consent that Order of Business No. 33, being Senate joint resolution No. 60, be taken up.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think we are entitled to dispose of the cases on the calendar as they stand in order. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada how long it will require to dispose of this joint resolution?

Mr. LODGE. It will take some time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say to the Senator that this joint resolution has been under consideration, I think, at three sessions during the morning hour, but is yet undisposed of. I know of but two Senators who desire to discuss it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LODGE. I object. It will take some time to consider the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the regular order will be proceeded with.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 33, being the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 60.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hardwick	Myers	Smoot
Bankhead	Hollis	Nelson	Sterling
Borah	Hughes	Newlands	Stone
Brandegee	Husting	Norris	Sutherland
Broussard	Jones	Oliver	Swanson
Bryan	Kenyon	Overman	Thomas
Catron	La Follette	Page	Tillman
Chamberlain	Lane	Poindexter	Townsend
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Colt	Lodge	Shields	Walsh
Curtis	McCumber	Simmons	Warren
Dillingham	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	Works
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.	

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who is absent, is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire this announcement to stand on all votes to-day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. My colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. He has a pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am requested to state that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] is absent on official business. He is paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. STONE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. REED] has been called from the city on important business and will not be present to-day. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is detained at home by sickness, and I will ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada to proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 60.

Mr. SMOOT. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator to withhold that request for a moment. The Senator from Nevada is willing to give way in order that the Senate may take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, as I understand

from him. I ask that that bill may now have the consideration of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

LINCOLN MEMORIAL COMMISSION.

For improvements in and additions to the Lincoln Memorial, and for masonry steps and approaches and terrace wall, not heretofore provided for, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, \$263,000, to remain available until expended, and the limit of cost of the said Lincoln Memorial is hereby increased from \$2,000,000 to \$2,594,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 7, to insert:

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMMISSION.

To enable the commission created by section 23 of the public buildings act approved March 4, 1913, to investigate and report to Congress a suitable design for a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from the city of Washington to a point at or near the Arlington estate in the State of Virginia, together with such surveys and estimates of cost as they may deem advisable, \$25,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 17, to insert:

BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY.

For investigating duplication of statistical and other work in the various branches of the Government service, \$1,200: *Provided*, That hereafter the Division of Efficiency of the Civil Service Commission shall be an independent establishment and shall be known as the Bureau of Efficiency; and the officers and employees of the said division shall be transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency without reappointment, and the records and papers pertaining to the work of the said division and the furniture, equipment, and supplies that have been purchased for it shall be transferred to the said bureau: *And provided further*, That the duties relating to efficiency ratings imposed upon the Civil Service Commission by section 4 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved August 23, 1912, and the duty of investigating the administrative needs of the service relating to personnel in the several executive departments and independent establishments, imposed on the Civil Service Commission by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 4, 1913, are transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill as to the part of the bill now under consideration, relating to the Bureau of Efficiency. Is it intended to be the effect of this amendment to put all the present employees of the bureau under the civil service, so as to make them permanent employees?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It has no relation whatever to the civil service. It makes no change in the existing law. It simply makes this an independent bureau, but all the rules of the civil service that apply now will continue to apply. It does not change the law in that respect at all.

This bureau has done splendid service. It has saved the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars at a very small relative cost, and this is to give it a more permanent status. To be perfectly frank, there is some friction in the bureau as now organized, and it is intended to remove that.

I have made careful inquiry, and I find that the bureau has done splendid service. This simply makes it an independent bureau instead of a bureau subordinate to the Civil Service Commission; but it does not change the civil-service status of a single employee—not one.

Mr. STONE. My inquiry was not intended to elicit the opinion of the Senator, though I am glad to have it, on the merits of the proposition as a whole. My attention was attracted to this language:

And the officers and employees of the said division shall be transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency without reappointment—

And so forth.

I am told that there are some persons now employed in the service of the Bureau of Efficiency who are not within the civil service, and the information I sought was whether the adoption of this amendment would, in effect, cover them into the civil service.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It will not. It does not change their status in any respect.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, also, that there are very few employees doing this work. They all have to be very technical men, as the Senator knows.

Mr. STONE. Yes; I think that is true. I will ask both the Senators, or the chairman of the committee especially, since what the Senator from Utah has just stated is true, as I believe it to be, why would it not be very well to amend this amendment so as to cover these employees, efficient men already employed and already performing satisfactory service, into the service permanently?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I think we had better not open the doors to a wide field of discussion about the civil-service matter. This amendment does not change the status of these employees at all, and I very much hope it will be allowed to go, because I believe it is an important measure for the benefit of the service. I hope that we will not go into the question of the civil service in respect to it.

Mr. STONE. Of course if it is going to provoke any discussion, or if the Senator seriously fears that it would, I will not press it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do; and I feel that the language of any such amendment ought to be carefully prepared. It is a matter that I would not myself be ready to dispose of at this time.

Mr. STONE. I yield entirely to the judgment of the Senator in regard to the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, and attendance at meetings of public officials, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 20, to insert:

For field examiners at the rate of \$1,500 per annum each, for work in connection with members of local boards and other necessary work as directed by the commission, \$300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," on page 4, after line 7, to insert:

Division of Mexican Affairs: For additional clerical services for the Division of Mexican Affairs, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of State, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to the bottom of page 8, the last item read being:

Cody, Wyo., post office: For commencement, \$500.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia with reference to some of the appropriations for the commencement of post-office buildings. This bill, as I understand, is an urgent deficiency bill. How does it happen that appropriations are made to commence public buildings under an urgent deficiency bill? Has an act been passed for the building?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. These appropriations are all routine estimates from the department. Not a single thing is done, except to appropriate for pending work that has already been authorized. The department is proceeding to carry out the orders of Congress, and it lacks the money. There is a deficiency.

Mr. KENYON. Are there certain limits of time, under those acts, within which commencement of the building must be made?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think not. I do not think it is usual to put in any limit of time. Perhaps it ought to be done; but there is no limit of time as to the commencement of the work under these appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. KENYON. I do not understand how the commencement of a building can be an urgent deficiency.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I make a statement to the Senator in that connection?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The first thing in arranging for a public building, after the law is passed authorizing the building and the limit of cost, is to draw the plans; but before that there is the examination of the site, the borings, etc., to know the character of the soil, subsoil, and so forth, as to the foundation, and how they are to arrange for foundation material, and also for the grading of the land on the site; this before the plans are made. Those small appropriations, some of them only \$500, comprehend the starting of the building.

Mr. KENYON. It does not mean the actual physical starting of the building, but merely the preparation of the plans?

Mr. WARREN. That and the plans, and in some cases the continuation of the building where it needs protection, and so forth.

Mr. KENYON. But will the Senator tell me why that is placed in an urgent deficiency bill?

Mr. WARREN. It is so that their office force may be employed on plans, and so that their engineers may be in the field, and not all have to be laid off and wait until such time as we pass the regular appropriation bills.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," subhead "Public buildings, construction, sites, and rent," on page 17, line 6, after "\$600,000," to insert:

Provided, That so much of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes," approved June 23, 1913 (38 Stats., 25), as authorizes the construction of a central heating, lighting, and power plant in the city of Washington, D. C., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to add to the buildings already enumerated in said act to be furnished with heat, light, and power the Johnson-Walker Building (known as the Navy Annex), the Interior Department Office Building, the Lincoln Memorial, and the Women's Memorial Building (Red Cross Building), and the limit of cost for said plant is hereby increased from \$1,494,104 to \$1,669,104, and the limit of \$35,000 therein fixed for the employment of technical services in connection with the plans and specifications and construction of said plant is hereby increased to not exceeding \$60,000 and made available for the employment of technical and clerical services for said purposes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to an amendment which I offer to come at the end of the appropriation regarding the central heating, lighting, and power plant in Washington, near the Mall.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the committee amendment as proposed in the bill, on page 18, line 2, after the word "purposes," the following:

Provided, That no work upon the construction of said plant shall be commenced until the plans therefor shall have been submitted to the National Fine Arts Commission for their approval and approved by the President of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, it is impossible to give intelligent consideration to a proposition like that, presented as it is. I suggest, and I hope it will be satisfactory to the Senator, that it be permitted to go on the bill, with a view to the investigation of the matter.

For instance, the amendment says "that no work * * * shall be commenced," and so forth. The work is already commenced. It is progressing now. The language might be changed, however. If there is anything in the plans which mars the beauty of the city it ought not to be done. I would be very willing for the Fine Arts Commission to be consulted, and I think it is well enough for that amendment to go on to afford opportunity for investigation.

I say that because if it should develop that there is no necessity for the amendment, and we did not persistently demand its retention, I want the Senator to understand it. I am as anxious as he is that no mistake shall be made, and I am very willing to have the amendment go on in order that it may be carefully investigated.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state, Mr. President, that that is entirely satisfactory to me. My only solicitude is to avoid un-sightliness in the neighborhood of the Mall; and I have no doubt that the matter can be disposed of satisfactorily.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It will have careful investigation. I am as anxious as the Senator is to avoid any unsightly structure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment stated again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the committee amendment, which comes on page 18, line 2, after the word "purposes," the following words:

Provided, That no work upon the construction of said plant shall be commenced until the plans therefor shall have been submitted to the National Fine Arts Commission for their approval and approved by the President of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Has not the work been already started on this plant?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It has, Mr. President; and therefore I said that we could not perfect this amendment now, but that I was willing to have it go on the bill in order that the conference committee might give it careful attention; and if anything is necessary along this line proper language will be provided.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Very well. It seems to me the amendment ought not to be adopted in that form.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, in the meantime is the work to be discontinued?

Mr. NEWLANDS. As I understand, the substantial work has not been commenced. There has been some work done with reference to excavation, but I do not think anything has

been done relating to the construction of the building. At all events, as the Senator from Virginia suggests, the amendment can be properly shaped.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it strikes me that if the Senator from Nevada would amend the resolution so as to provide that the plans shall be submitted to the National Fine Arts Commission for the purpose of suggesting changes, and such changes as they may suggest shall be adopted, with the approval of the President, the work can go right along.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that, as I understand the amendment, that is substantially what it does. If it does not do that, and if any change of phraseology is necessary, it will be perfected in conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest that there is a general statute on the subject providing that these public buildings shall not be erected until they have been submitted to this commission.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, within an hour or two I have received for my consideration in relation to this item a statement which is rather startling in its nature, particularly as to what the ultimate cost of the undertaking will be; and, further, that it is the intention to carry steam through pipes under the streets of the city from one building to the other at a pressure of 270 pounds for furnishing power for the operation of elevators and heating the buildings. I do not know whether there is any truth in the statement or not.

I had hoped that the matter could go over until Monday, but I shall not interpose any objection to its consideration and passage now, knowing that between now and the time the item shall be considered in conference I can get additional information. If there is any vital objection, and if the assertions contained in the statement submitted to me are correct, then, of course, I know that the conferees will take it under consideration.

Therefore I shall not object to the consideration of the matter at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator can rest assured that the conferees will be glad to have the data which he may get and give them careful consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. McLEAN obtained the floor.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The chairman of the committee is not here. I do not know what his wishes are.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the present, and when the chairman of the committee comes in we will hear what he has to say. We had just as well finish the appropriation bill.

Mr. McLEAN. The chairman of the committee told me that he would be absent for a few minutes and would soon return. I shall occupy only a very few moments.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have sent half a dozen messengers to look for the chairman of the Philippine Committee without being able to find him. Under the circumstances I hope the Senator from Connecticut will defer his remarks for the present.

Mr. McLEAN. I will state to the Senator from Virginia that I was about to proceed with the knowledge of the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines, but if the matter before the Senate is not to take all the afternoon, I have no objection to yielding for the present.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am sure the appropriation bill will be finished in a very few moments.

Mr. McLEAN. Very well.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to laying aside the unfinished business temporarily and proceeding with the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill? The Chair hears none.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Public buildings, repairs and equipment," on page 19, line 10, after "nineteen hundred and sixteen," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

Repairs and preservation: For repairs and preservation of all completed and occupied public buildings and the grounds thereof, including

the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Collecting internal revenue," on page 20, after line 8, to insert:

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized to reopen and allow claims for taxes for the recovery of which suits are pending and which would be allowable under the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of McCoach, collector, against Minehill & Schuylkill Haven Railroad Co.; and there is hereby appropriated for the payment of such claims a total sum not to exceed \$300,000, this appropriation to be available for the payment of such of the aforesaid claims as are not payable out of moneys heretofore appropriated and available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, for the payment of claims.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 9, to insert:

BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

The limitation in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916 as to the number of delivered sheets of United States currency to be executed is hereby increased from 82,000,000 to 90,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 15, to insert:

For engravers' and printers' materials and other materials, except distinctive paper, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer \$120,000 from other appropriations made for the fiscal year 1916, as follows: From "Salaries of all necessary employees, other than plate printers and plate printers' assistants," \$75,000, and from "Wages of plate printers," \$45,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Public Health Service," on page 22, after line 5, to insert:

For special studies of and demonstration work in rural sanitation, including personal service, \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he thinks \$50,000 is sufficient to meet the emergency just now?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that this is intended to run only until the 30th of June. We had before us the Surgeon General, in charge of the Public Health Service, and we concluded, after hearing all he had to say, that \$50,000, in addition to what has heretofore been appropriated, will meet the necessities until the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. VARDAMAN. All I desire is that this service shall not be crippled. It is just in the infancy of its great work, and it was my understanding that the department had most earnestly asked for \$100,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that that recommendation was made, but it was intended to go beyond the 30th of June.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am perfectly willing, after what the Senator says, that the appropriation shall remain as proposed by the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Surgeon General appeared before us, and we are satisfied that this appropriation will answer until the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. SMOOT. It is perfectly satisfactory to the Public Health Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "District of Columbia," on page 22, after line 22, to insert:

Publication of notices in condemnation cases: The provision contained in the urgent deficiency act for the fiscal year 1913, approved October 22, 1913, regarding notice by publication in condemnation cases for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of streets, avenues, roads, highways, alleys, or minor streets in the District of Columbia is hereby repealed, and section 491c of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia be, and the same is hereby, reenacted so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 491c. The said court shall cause public notice of not less than 20 days to be given of the institution of such proceeding, by advertisement in three daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia, which notice shall warn and require all persons having any interest in the proceeding to appear in court at a day to be named in said notice and to continue in attendance until the court shall have made its final order ratifying and confirming the award of damages and the assessment of benefits by the jury herein provided for; and in addition to such public notice said court shall cause a copy of said notice to be served by the United States marshal for the District of Columbia, or his deputies, upon such owners of the land to be condemned as can be found by said marshal, or his deputies, within the District of Columbia and upon the tenants and occupants of the same. The said court shall appoint a guardian ad litem for any person interested in the proceedings who may be under disability."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 4, to insert:

Public schools: For additional amount necessary for construction of an eight-room addition, including an assembly hall, to the Powell School, \$9,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," on page 25, after line 18, to insert:

For rental of additional quarters for the Navy Department, \$1,250.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. My attention has been called to the wisdom of inserting a few words there. In line 20, after the figures "\$1,250," I move to amend by adding "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," at the top of page 28, to insert:

NATIONAL PARKS.

There is appropriated from the several appropriations for protection, improvement, and management, etc., of the various national parks, including the Hot Springs Reservation, as well as from the revenues from privileges, etc., in the national parks and the Hot Springs Reservation, such sum or sums as the Secretary of the Interior in his judgment may deem necessary, to be expended in employment of the superintendent of national parks and not exceeding four other competent persons in the District of Columbia and in the field, and other necessary expenses in connection with the administration of the national parks and the Hot Springs Reservation, including expenses of travel incident to the transferring of employees from one park to another and of park supervisors in conferring with the superintendent of national parks; a detailed statement of such expenditures to be submitted to Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 2 on page 29.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move to strike out lines 3, 4, and 5 on page 29, in the following words:

For payment of limited indemnity for the loss of pieces of domestic registered matter, first, third, and fourth classes, fiscal year 1914, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 10 on page 29.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the period at the end of line 10 be stricken out and to insert in lieu thereof a semi-colon, and after line 10 to insert "1914, \$5,000."

I will say, Mr. President, that I move this little alteration in pursuance of a letter received from the Postmaster General, in order that this appropriation may be applicable to pay for insured mail as well as the classes of mail provided for already in the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the communication, which I send to the desk, from the Postmaster General be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1916.

Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My attention has been called to the provisions of page 23, lines 3, 4, and 5, of H. R. 9416, as passed by the House of Representatives, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years. The lines in question read as follows:

"For payment of limited indemnity for the loss of pieces of domestic registered matter, first, third, and fourth classes, fiscal year 1914, \$5,000."

The purpose of this deficiency item is to pay claims for indemnity arising on account of the loss of insured mail as well as registered mail. On January 1, 1913, the privilege to register fourth-class mail was withdrawn, as at that time the law was placed into effect providing for the insurance of fourth-class or parcel-post mail, as contemplated by the act of August 24, 1912. Therefore, during the fiscal year 1914 the department paid indemnity for the loss of registered, insured, and collect-on-delivery mail. Authority was granted in the deficiency appropriation act approved July 29, 1914, for the payment of limited indemnity for lost insured and collect-on-delivery mail out of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1914 by the following provision:

"For payment of limited indemnity for lost insured and collect-on-delivery mail, \$35,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$60,000 for payment of limited indemnity for the loss of pieces of registered matter, first, third, and fourth classes, for the fiscal year 1914."

As the total amount appropriated by this act (approved July 29, 1914) has been entirely exhausted, it is thought that the provision in the pending deficiency appropriation act (H. R. 9416) will make the funds available for payment of indemnity for lost registered mail only. For the fiscal years 1915 and 1916 there has been only one annual appropriation out of which to pay claims for indemnity for both registered and insured mail, but both classes of mail have been stipulated.

Under these circumstances I beg to request the following amendment to the act in question: That lines 3, 4, and 5 on page 23 be stricken out and that between the present lines 10 and 11 a line be inserted reading "1914, \$5,000."

Unless this amendment is made, it is not believed that the appropriation will be available for the payment of claims for lost insured and collect-on-delivery mail.

Respectfully,

A. S. BURLISON,
Postmaster General.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Agriculture," subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry," on page 30, after line 21, to insert:

For the emergency caused by the infectious nature and continued spread of the destructive disease of pine trees known as the white pine

blister rust, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, \$20,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay such expense and employ such persons and means, and to cooperate with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 7, to insert:

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY.

To meet the emergency caused by the prevalence and continued spread of rabies in wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals, which is being communicated by them to stock and other domestic animals, on the public lands, national forests, and elsewhere, in the Western and Northwestern States, by the destruction of such wild animals, \$75,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to incur such expense and to employ such persons and means, as, in his judgment, may be necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes of this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Commerce," subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 33, after line 1, to insert:

For clerk to the superintendent, at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, from February 1 to June 30, 1916, both dates inclusive, \$750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Fisheries," on page 33, line 10, after the date "nineteen hundred and sixteen," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500," so as to make the clause read:

Maintenance of vessels: For maintenance of vessels and launches, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 35, after line 3, to insert:

SENATE.

The Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay to Mary Meyer, niece of Jacob C. Donaldson, deceased, late a skilled laborer in the Senate Library, the amount of salary due him for the month of December, 1915.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 9, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, and for all necessary personal and other services for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building, under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Government Printing Office," subhead "Printing and binding," on page 35, after line 22, to insert:

Holidays: To enable the Public Printer to comply with the provisions of the law granting holidays and the Executive order granting half holidays with pay to the employees of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal years that follow:

Nineteen hundred and sixteen, \$27,305.93;
Nineteen hundred and fifteen, \$270.22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 4, to insert:

Leaves of absence: To enable the Public Printer to comply with the provisions of the law granting leave to employees of the Government Printing Office, \$48,866.76, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 17, to insert:

For printing and binding for the Court of Claims, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judgments, United States courts," on page 37, line 2, after the word "sixty-three," to insert "and Senate Document No. 253," so as to make the clause read:

For payment of the final judgments and decrees, including costs of suits, which have been rendered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," certified to Congress at its present session by the Attorney General in House Document No. 563 and Senate Document No. 253, and which have not been appealed, namely.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 4, after the words "Treasury Department," to strike out "\$744" and insert "\$1,097," so as to make the clause read:

Under the Treasury Department, \$1,097.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 5, after the words "War Department," to strike out "\$1,060.53" and insert "\$5,714.42," so as to make the clause read:

Under the War Department, \$5,714.42.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 7, after the words "In all," to strike out "\$2,388.28" and insert "\$7,395.17," so as to make the clause read:

In all, \$7,395.17; together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on the respective judgments at the rate of 4 per cent per annum from the date thereof until the time this appropriation is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judgments, Court of Claims," on page 37, line 14, after the number "566," to insert "and Senate Document No. 252," so as to make the clause read:

For the payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, reported to Congress at its present session in House Document No. 566 and Senate Document No. 252, namely,

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 16, after the words "Treasury Department," to strike out "\$52,986.35" and insert "\$52,988.23," so as to make the clause read:

Under the Treasury Department, \$52,988.23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 18, after the words "War Department," to strike out "\$67,115.23" and insert "\$87,645.05," so as to make the clause read:

Under the War Department, \$87,645.05.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 19, after the words "Navy Department," to strike out "\$90,244.77," and insert "\$97,373.74," so as to make the clause read:

Under the Navy Department, \$97,373.74.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 20, to insert:

Under the Department of Agriculture, \$34.45.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 22, after the words "In all," to strike out "\$210,411.06," and insert "\$238,106.18," so as to make the clause read:

In all, \$238,106.18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Claims allowed by the Auditor for the State and other departments," on page 50, after line 18, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 3. That for the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1913 and other years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 255, reported to Congress at its present session, there is appropriated as follows:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

For refunding taxes illegally collected, \$28,406.30.
For payment of judgments against internal-revenue officers, \$2,985.95.
For pay of crews, miscellaneous expenses, etc., Life-Saving Service, \$17.77.
For Life-Saving Service, \$600.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

For pay, etc., of the Army, \$5,412.54.
For extra-duty pay to enlisted men as clerks at Army division and department headquarters, \$369.60.
For mileage to officers and contract surgeons, \$28.10.
For regular supplies, Quartermaster's Department, \$81.88.
For incidental expenses, Quartermaster's Department, \$5,592.65.
For barracks and quarters, \$44.40.
For transportation of the Army and its supplies, \$69.15.
For headstones for graves of soldiers, \$1.66.
For raising four additional regiments, \$46.35.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For pay of the Navy, \$757.52.
For pay, miscellaneous, \$127.12.
For pay, Marine Corps, \$66.60.
For transportation, Bureau of Navigation, \$536.09.
For maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, \$65.20.
For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$4.
For construction and repair, Bureau of Construction and Repair, \$204.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1915, \$969.96.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1914, \$80.73.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 70 cents.
For Indian school, Fort Bidwell, Cal., repairs and improvements, 1915, \$15.36.
For Army pensions, 10 cents.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

For contingent expenses, Executive Office, 1914, 88 cents.
For salaries of vice consuls (act of Feb. 5, 1915), 1915, \$79.17.
For allowance for clerks at consulates, \$80.

For relief and protection of American seamen, 1915, \$594.96.
For contingent expenses, Department of Commerce and Labor, \$7.84.
For expenses of regulating immigration, \$144.25.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1915, \$82.20.
For fees of jurors, United States courts, \$51.
For support of prisoners, United States courts, \$1.30.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This completes the committee amendments.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, after line 9, insert:

To pay the subscription of the United States to the International Geodetic Association for the years 1915 and 1916, \$3,000.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator from California that the committee did not allow that item, but speaking for myself personally I am by no means certain that it ought not to be allowed. I am very willing that it shall go into the bill and have careful investigation in conference. I am not at all satisfied with the action of the committee in not allowing it.

Mr. WORKS. The matter was in the special charge of my colleague [Mr. PHELAN], and not knowing that the bill was to come up to-day my colleague is absent from the Senate. I am presenting it on his account. I greatly appreciate the fact that the chairman of the committee will allow it to go in the bill, its merit to be determined hereafter.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It certainly shall have careful consideration.

Mr. WORKS. In connection with the amendment I should like to have printed a letter which I received from the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, giving the particulars and the reasons why the appropriation should be made, and also a statement in connection with it signed by other persons interested in having the appropriation made. With that leave I shall submit it.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY,
Washington, January 18, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Regarding the matter of the International Geodetic Association, and its work at the latitude station located at Ukiah, Cal., and my promise yesterday to furnish you with data in connection with the emergency appropriation relative to this observatory, I beg to submit the following:

THE UKIAH OBSERVATORY.

For many years the determination of latitude was very much complicated by the shifting of the earth's axis of rotation. The motion of the earth's axis is a very irregular one and does not follow any known law.

In order that this subject might be studied and the law of the shifting of the axis be discovered, the International Geodetic Association, in 1899, established five stations on the thirty-ninth parallel of latitude as equally spaced as possible around the globe. Two of these stations were located in the United States, one at Gaithersburg, Md., and the other at Ukiah, Cal.

At each of these stations, except Gaithersburg, continuous observations have been made. There are many astronomers throughout the world who are continuously using the results obtained at these latitude stations to correct their observations, and it is of the greatest importance to them to have the latitude work continued without interruption for an indefinite period.

On September 14, 1915, Dr. F. R. Helmert, director of the central bureau of the International Geodetic Association, whose office is at Potsdam, Germany, wrote me a letter of which the following is a partial translation:

"Your letter of August 19 has to-day been received. The Ukiah observation book for July has also come to hand. * * * It is to be hoped that Japan and Italy, as well as Russia, will maintain their stations at Mizusawa, Carloforte, and Tschardjul. If they support those stations, they will not be expected to pay their yearly quota, for the support of these observatories would balance the yearly contribution to the association. With the American stations the situation is different. The United States has paid no quota during the year 1914, and it was necessary, for that reason, to discontinue the observations at Gaithersburg, Md. Because of the scarcity of money on account of the war we must also eventually close Ukiah. In 1915 only a few quotas were received, and in 1916 it is certain that nothing more will be paid. * * * Permit me to make the request on you that everything possible be done to continue the work of the international latitude service in North America."

It will be seen from this that one of the two stations in the United States was closed because of our failure to pay our part of the expenses of the International Geodetic Association, and it will also be seen that the observations at Ukiah must be discontinued unless we resume payment of our quota.

There is attached to this letter a table showing the amount of money spent in the United States each year for the maintenance of the observatories at Gaithersburg and Ukiah since the beginning of the work in 1899. The total amount shown in the table is about \$65,000. During the time that the latitude work was going on in the United States we paid into the treasury of the International Geodetic Association only \$24,000.

This shows that the association spent over twice as much in the United States as we paid into the treasury. If the United States resumes the payment of its quota, it is reasonably certain that the central bureau will continue the work at Ukiah and it is possible that, after the close of the European war, it may also resume observations at Gaithersburg.

It is because few, if any, of the nations now at war will be able to pay their quotas into the treasury of the association while the war is in progress that \$2,500 has been asked for in the urgent deficiency bill with which to maintain the observatory at Ukiah until the International Geodetic Association finds it possible to resume its support after peace has been declared. There is also an item of \$3,000 in the same bill to be used in paying our quota to the association for the two years 1914 and 1915.

As it costs about \$1,700 to pay the expenses of the Ukiah station for a year, the sum requested in the bill—\$2,500—will continue the work for about 18 months.

The accompanying statement shows that the International Geodetic Association has spent much more money in the United States than we have contributed to its treasury, and therefore we should feel it a duty to make up the arrears in our promised contribution. Even if the association had spent nothing in this country, we should still feel it to our advantage to maintain our membership and pay our quota.

The work of the association is of great importance to every civilized nation, for there are many world-wide problems with which only an international association can deal. The problems come under this head. As long as people are interested in the search for truth they will wish to know the exact shape and size of the earth, partly from a desire to know the facts in the case and partly because such exact information is of advantage in conducting scientific and astronomic investigations. The figure of the earth can only be determined with a great degree of accuracy when the geodetic observations of many nations are combined, and it is necessary that some international association should assemble the results and solve the problems.

There are other operations of the association the results of which have more obvious value. One is the coordination of the geodetic results of the surveys of each of two contiguous nations, which enables them to give to points on their common boundary the same geographic positions and elevations on the maps of the two countries. Such an agreement of maps would obviate many disputes in regard to boundaries which might otherwise occur.

Another problem which it is impossible for any one nation to solve is the derivation of a formula which will give the value of the intensity of gravity at any latitude. The gravity observations are made by many nations, but one central bureau must coordinate all the results.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE ASSOCIATION.

Although the United States did not contribute to the International Geodetic Association in 1914, the permanent secretary of the association invited the United States representative, Dr. O. H. Tittmann, to vote on the question of whether or not the association should continue in force for another 10 years or the previously adopted convention and whether or not there should be any alterations in this convention when the present one expires on December 31, 1916. The authority for Dr. Tittmann's reply to the permanent secretary was given in a letter of which the following is a copy:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 22, 1914.

Hon. WM. C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I find that I have not answered your inquiry of November 24. The appropriation asked for as our share of the permanent advisory committee of the International Geodetic Association is so small that I heartily agree with you in the opinion that we should continue our membership, and that our representatives should be advised to so vote. I shall be glad to join with you in recommending action to Congress.

Very truly, yours, W. J. BRYAN.

Upon receipt of this letter Dr. Tittmann wrote to the permanent secretary of the association that the United States voted to continue the convention without change for another 10 years.

From this it will be seen that Dr. Tittmann was empowered by the Secretary of State to vote for the continuation of an international agreement among practically all of the civilized nations of the world. In spite of the authority vested in Dr. Tittmann and in spite of his action in voting to continue the convention of the association for another 10-year period, an action which should have the strength of a treaty, our Congress has failed to appropriate money for our quota. This, of course, places the United States in a very awkward and embarrassing position.

Upon Dr. Tittmann's resignation last spring as a member of the permanent committee of the International Geodetic Association the question of his successor arose, and I recommended that Mr. William Bowie, at the present time Chief of the Division of Geodesy of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, be designated as a member of the permanent commission of the association in succession to Dr. Tittmann. In a letter, dated June 12, 1915, the Secretary of State ad interim, Hon. Robert Lansing, wrote in part as follows:

"In reply I have the honor to say that it does not appear from the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, that Congress has made any provision for the continuance during the fiscal year of membership by the United States in the International Geodetic Association. This department would not, therefore, seem to be in a position to comply with your request."

It is my urgent desire that Congress appropriate money for the continuation of the work at Ukiah during the progress of the European war, and that it will also appropriate sufficient funds to pay our arrears in dues to the association for the two years 1914 and 1915.

As the representative of the United States has always been a member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, this bureau feels particularly humiliated because of our failure to meet our obligations.

There is transmitted herewith a photostat copy of a letter, dated December 3, 1915, signed by several prominent astronomers of the Pacific coast and indorsed by the presidents of the University of California and of Leland Stanford Junior University. An original copy of this letter was sent by Dr. Campbell, of the Lick Observatory, to you and the other Senator and Representatives from California. It is an urgent plea to Congress to provide funds for the support of the Ukiah Observatory:

The table mentioned in the third paragraph of the second page of this letter, showing the amount of money paid by the United States

to the International Geodetic Association and the amount expended by the association in the United States, follows:

Fiscal year.	United States quota.	Expended in the United States.
1899.....	\$1,500	Marks. 2,812
1900.....	1,500	17,350
1901.....	1,500	18,051
1902.....	1,500	18,060
1903.....	1,500	17,000
1904.....	1,500	17,000
1905.....	1,500	17,000
1906.....	1,500	18,000
1907.....	1,500	16,000
1908.....	1,500	17,000
1909.....	1,500	17,000
1910.....	1,500	17,000
1911.....	1,500	17,000
1912.....	1,500	17,000
1913.....	1,500	17,000
1914.....	1,500	17,000
1915.....		9,000
1916.....		
	24,000	269,273 .24
		1077092 538546
Cost of zenith tube.....		\$64,625.52 2,500.00
		65,125.52

There is an apparent discrepancy between this table and the quotation from Dr. Helmert's letter, but not a real one, for the amounts of the United States quota given in the table are for fiscal years, and, therefore, the 1914 quota, as mentioned in the table, was paid to Dr. Helmert during the calendar year 1913. Dr. Helmert is correct in his statement that during the (calendar) year 1914 and again in 1915 no funds were received from the United States.

If the above information is not clear to you, please let me know, and I will gladly furnish you any additional details.

I am, respectfully, yours,
E. LESTER JONES, Superintendent.

MOUNT HAMILTON, CAL., December 3, 1915.

DEAR SIR: We respectfully call your attention to the problem of the International Latitude Observatory at Ukiah, Cal. In effect, that observatory was maintained by the United States Government from early in 1899 to the end of 1913, on the basis of congressional appropriations contributed through the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey to the International Geodetic Association, the latter administered from headquarters at Potsdam, Germany. Although the United States Government was pledged to lend its further support, in so far as the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Department of Commerce could make such a pledge, the Congress in 1913 failed to continue the appropriations (\$1,500 per annum) of the preceding 14 years. The Ukiah Observatory has been supported during the years 1914 and 1915 on funds appropriated by all the leading countries of the world except the United States, notwithstanding the existence of war conditions in those countries. The funds from foreign countries are available to maintain the Ukiah Observatory until April or May, 1916; these funds will then cease to come. We feel that the maintenance of the Ukiah Observatory by Congress is a debt and an obligation of honor. With the United States at peace and all other leading countries which support the international association at war, our obligation seems to be accentuated.

The International Geodetic Association is an organization composed of the geodetic survey departments of the leading national Governments. The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey is a member. The association's purpose is to promote the solution of those problems of the earth, such as the earth's size, shape, gravitational power, etc., which demand that observations be made in many widely distributed countries and which therefore require international cooperation.

In the eighties it was discovered that the latitudes (and to a small degree the longitudes) of all points on the earth are constantly changing. The earth as a whole "wobbles" a little as it rotates on its axis. This affects all precision surveys of the earth more or less seriously. To determine the amount of the changes, the law of the changes, and, if possible, the reasons for the changes, the International Geodetic Association established in 1898-99 four special observatories, distributed as uniformly as practicable around the earth on the same parallel of latitude, north 39° 8'—one observatory in Maryland, one at Ukiah, Cal., one in Japan, and one in Sardinia (Italy). Later the Russian Government established a similar observatory in Turkestan in latitude 39° 8', and considerably later, the Cincinnati Observatory, happening to have the same latitude, 39° 8', voluntarily and at its own expense, assumed a share in the work. (It is absolutely necessary that all these observatories be on the same parallel of latitude so that they can observe the same stars in their zeniths.)

For lack of funds the observatory in Maryland has first been discontinued. The closing of the Ukiah Observatory would deal a terrible blow to the plans, because it occupies a strong strategic position in longitude. The circuit of the earth in latitude north 39° 8' and the international latitude observatories on that circuit are represented in the accompanying figure.

(Figure omitted.)
You will see that, without the Ukiah station, the Cincinnati station would be alone in five-eighths of the circuit of the globe, with Japan, Turkestan, and Sardinia relatively close together in the remaining three-eighths of the circuit, and that the three-eighths from Cincinnati to Japan would be wholly unoccupied. The solution of the International

latitude problem on the basis of observatories in Japan, Turkestan, Sardinia, and Cincinnati is entirely analogous to the building of a great circular tower upon a foundation consisting of four piers, distributed irregularly on a circle, as Japan, Turkestan, Sardinia, and Cincinnati are located in the above sketch. An observing station on the Pacific coast of the United States, in latitude $39^{\circ} 8'$ —that is, at Ukiah—is demanded in order to give a satisfactory support to the international structure.

The motion of the earth, involving variations of latitudes, has not gone through a complete cycle of change since these international observatories were established, and the observations should be continued at least until the variations become predictable. We respectfully request your support of an item in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for the maintenance of the Ukiah international latitude station, to be applied as the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey considers most desirable and efficient.

Yours, respectfully,

W. W. CAMPBELL,
*Director of the Lick Observatory,
University of California.*
A. O. LEUSCHNER,
*Director Students' Observatory and Professor of
Astronomy, University of California.*
SIDNEY D. TOWNLEY,
*Professor in Leland Stanford Junior University,
in Charge of Astronomical Instruction.*

We approve of the foregoing.

BENJ. IDE WHEELER,
President University of California.
J. C. BRANNER,
President Leland Stanford Junior University.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] is agreed to.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, inasmuch as I was not able to be present at the meeting of the committee, how the second item on page 2 happens to come into an urgent deficiency appropriation bill—an item of \$25,000 for the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It comes in the deficiency bill, Mr. President, because the expenditure was authorized by Congress, and the money has not been appropriated. There is a deficiency of money to carry out the instruction of Congress. A commission of three was created, of which the President is one, with instructions to make an investigation as to a suitable design for a memorial bridge. The money has not been appropriated and the commission ask that they be given the money to carry out the instruction of Congress. It is manifestly a deficiency under existing law.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think I recognize the desirability of a bridge in this locality, but I have wondered if, with the condition of our national finances at the present time, it has been a good thing to insert this item of \$25,000 in the bill. I understand, of course, how desirable it is to the Senator from Virginia, and how important, perhaps, it is to the city of Washington that such a bridge should be constructed at some time, and if we had the money, if we were not trying to economize to meet some conditions which are an absolute necessity, I should not even raise the question as to the propriety of the appropriation. However, I still feel that it was a mistake at this time to put this item into an urgent deficiency bill, when at least it is a matter that would not suffer if it were postponed to a time when we would know where the money is coming from to meet the expenses of the Government.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not like to object to appropriations; I know it is unpopular; but I should like to ask the chairman about the appropriation for a post-office building at Binghamton, N. Y. This bill carries \$100,000 for a site for a post office in a city that, according to the census of 1910, has 48,000 people. It seems to me that is a tremendous amount of money to pay for a site. Why should the site be provided for in the urgent deficiency bill I can not just get through my head.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the purchase of these sites and the erection of these buildings was authorized, and work has been proceeding more rapidly in recent days than formerly. It has gotten to a point now where the Secretary of the Treasury needs the money for these purposes. The items here appropriating money for post-office sites and post-office buildings are within the limit already authorized, and were duly estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury and asked for as urgently necessary.

He is ready to go on with the work. He has a force in the architect's office, and he wants to proceed with the work Congress ordered him to do. He lacks the money. The money is a deficiency for a purpose for which Congress has authorized the work to be done. He estimates for it. There is not an item here that was put on at the instance of any Senator; it was done purely on the certificate from the Secretary of the Treasury that these amounts are urgently needed, and they are appropriated accordingly.

Mr. KENYON. I am not going to take any time on it. I assume the Federal court is held at Binghamton, N. Y. It does seem to me to spend \$100,000 for a site for a post office in a town of 48,000 is, to say the least, pretty strong.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will excuse me for a moment, I will say I have no doubt there is not a dollar provided here except what was authorized. I have no doubt the Secretary of the Treasury has contracted for the purchase of this property in pursuance of the act of Congress, and it is an absolute liability on the Government just as much as the coupons on its bonds. He was authorized to make this purchase; he has contracted for the property, and he needs the money to pay for the property.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. How much money has been appropriated for the construction of the building?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not recall the amount appropriated, but it is within the limit, I think, provided by the act of Congress. There is not a single dollar appropriated here except in accordance with previous legislation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator does not know the amount of money that has been appropriated for the construction of the post-office building?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I can look it up. I can not carry those figures in my mind.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I have not surrendered the floor. Has the Senator any information in his records about the courthouse at Binghamton, as to what courts are held there?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that I have no information in respect to that subject.

Mr. KENYON. I simply want, Mr. President, in a mild way to raise an objection to providing for Federal buildings in an urgent deficiency appropriation bill. There are here some 13 pages of appropriations for public buildings, many of them for the commencement of public buildings and some of them in towns of less than a thousand people. The Senator from Utah predicted some time ago that the urgent deficiency bills would amount to \$20,000,000 this session. I think he was rather criticized and laughed at about it, but it is apparent now that they will go vastly beyond that sum, perhaps to \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000. It is because in the future I myself may object to some of these appropriations that I simply did not want to sit quietly and have them go by without a protest.

Mr. BRYAN. I will state that the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department, acting together, have declined to spend any money for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in a town of less than 5,000 people, and also in towns which have not \$15,000 of receipts per annum.

Mr. KENYON. I desire to understand the Senator.

Mr. BRYAN. Notwithstanding that the act of Congress authorized the construction of buildings in towns of smaller population.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. Just one moment. Does the Senator from Florida say that the Secretary of the Treasury has refused to commence the construction of buildings in towns of less than 5,000 people?

Mr. BRYAN. That is my understanding, and I got it authoritatively from the department.

Mr. KENYON. I venture to say there are at least 10 provisions in this bill for the erection of buildings in towns of less than 5,000 population.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I merely wanted to correct the statement made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. On the contrary, I know where acts of Congress have authorized buildings in towns of less than 5,000 inhabitants and having less than \$10,000 receipts. The sites for such buildings at least have been purchased in some instances. For that matter, with the permission of the Senator, I will say, if he still yields to me, that I do not see how the Secretary of the Treasury could possibly have the right not to carry out a law after it had been passed by Congress. I am not criticizing him for doing it. The responsibility is on Congress for making such appropriations.

Mr. BRYAN. I agree with the Senator in his last statement; but I know that what I have stated has been the attitude taken by the department. It has been publicly stated that the department would not erect a public building in a city of less than 5,000 population or in which the post-office receipts do not amount to \$15,000 annually. That is a confested point between the legislative branch and the executive branch of the Gov-

ernment. A speech was made in the House of Representatives only a few days ago taking the position that the Treasury Department had no right to refuse to carry out the will of Congress which authorized the construction of public buildings in towns of less than 5,000 people and having less than \$10,000 receipts annually.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know who has the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. I merely want to say to the Senator that no matter where he got his information, surely, from my own knowledge, I know he is mistaken in his statement of facts.

Mr. BRYAN. I got it from the department.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not care who gave the information to the Senator. I know of instances in my own State where there are cities of less than 5,000 people and with less than \$10,000 receipts, where appropriations have at least been made for the purchase of sites for public buildings.

Mr. BRYAN. It may be that I am mistaken as to the attitude of the department with reference to the purchase of sites for public buildings; but does the Senator from Georgia know whether such buildings have been erected?

Mr. HARDWICK. I think so, in cases where they have less than that number of population, but I do not know as to the receipts.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, I understand it may be a question of whether they can make the Secretary of the Treasury believe that they have more people than they really have.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, the people we have there are pretty fine. There is no trouble about their quality, even though we have not the quantity.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida what is the population of De Land, Fla.? According to the census of 1910 the population was 2,812.

Mr. BRYAN. What are the annual receipts?

Mr. KENYON. I have no statement as to the receipts; but this bill makes an appropriation of \$12,000 for the commencement of a building there.

Mr. BRYAN. I imagine it comes under the rule as to towns where the receipts are above \$15,000.

Mr. KENYON. Even though the town may be below 5,000 population, if the receipts exceed \$15,000, the Treasury Department will go ahead with the work? I simply want to say that there are appropriations scattered all through this bill for the commencement of public buildings in towns of less than 5,000 population.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish merely again to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that, as to these buildings, it may be that Congress acted unwisely; but the buildings have been authorized by law. The time to object was when they were proposed to be authorized; but after the Secretary of the Treasury has been authorized and directed to acquire sites and to construct buildings it is too late to say that the towns were too small and that the receipts were too small to justify that course. There is not a dollar appropriated in this bill except in pursuance of previous legislation by Congress—not one dollar.

Mr. KENYON. I realize that that is true. I regret that I did not have an opportunity to object to them when the provisions were under consideration; but I am going to object now, and I am going to keep on objecting whenever an appropriation is presented here for a public building in a town of less than a thousand people. I think it is not a proper way to spend the public money, especially in times of financial distress such as we just now have.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Virginia a question in relation to the appropriation for Binghamton, which is \$100,000. I noticed a moment ago that great care was taken to insert after an item appropriating \$1,250 the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary." If it was important to add those words there, why would it not be well to add them here?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no objection, Mr. President, to having those words added. I move that the language suggested by the Senator from Washington be inserted at the point to which he refers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 2, after the sum "\$100,000," it is proposed to insert "or so much thereof as may be necessary," so as to read—

Binghamton, N. Y., post office, courthouse, etc.: For site, \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, my observations will be brief, as usual.

Before the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] offered his amendment or substitute I felt, and I think a majority of the Senate felt, that this important matter would be disposed of wisely and honorably and satisfactorily by the enactment of the bill as it came from the committee. The bill was drawn with great care. It met the views of the President and all those now in authority in the Philippine Islands. It has been under consideration and subject to criticism for two years. The committee heard many witnesses whose opinions were entitled to great credit because of their long experience in the islands and their study of the problem which faces us there. If my recollection is correct, not a single witness believed that the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands could maintain a stable and just government now or at any time within four years.

Gen. McIntyre, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, in his testimony before the committee stated the case very clearly, as it seems to me. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] asked him this question:

Is it your opinion that if these people are turned loose to work out their own salvation they will maintain a stable government there and become more and more educated and civilized and competent to take care of themselves?

Gen. MCINTYRE. Well, the theory of this bill is that at this time they are not.

Senator REED. I say, is it your opinion that they will, if they are given the right to govern themselves—will they develop along the right lines?

Gen. MCINTYRE. Do you mean if they were given independence to-day?

Senator REED. Oh, no; in a reasonable time.

Gen. MCINTYRE. Well, I think that would have to be studied very carefully at the time, Senator REED. My disposition is to think that that is somewhat in the future.

There were Senators on the committee who wanted the United States to be relieved of all responsibility in the islands as soon as possible; but I think those Senators felt that we could not abandon now a plain duty to a people whose guardianship we had solemnly assumed. The bill received the unanimous support of the Democrats on the committee, and I think the Republican opposition was mainly directed to the preamble.

From the first the effort of the committee was to get at the wise and safe thing to do in a nonpartisan spirit, and I think the Democratic members of the committee deserve great credit for the wise and impartial way in which they accomplished their work.

But now, Mr. President, the wind has changed, and I think it is blowing from a very dangerous quarter. As soon as I could I submitted the substitute offered by the Senator from Arkansas to two men in high authority in the military and naval service of the United States. Both of them agreed that for us to retain responsibilities in the islands of any name or nature in conjunction with other nations would be a dangerous thing to do.

Gov. Martin, in his statement before the committee upon this question, gave the following answer in response to this question by the chairman:

Suppose we had an international agreement with Japan, Germany, and Great Britain to maintain the independence of the Philippine Islands, do you think the Philippine Islands would still be a difficulty in case of war or likely to provoke a war?

Mr. MARTIN. I asked that question in Manila not long ago of a gentleman whose opinion I wanted. There were some foreign sailors in Manila who were on what we call the Luneta. That is an open field. It runs between the sea and the city. It is territory that is reclaimed from the sea. He said, "I would expect within a few months some drunken sailors would get into a riot or a fight with some Filipinos on the Luneta, and that that nation would say the Filipino people have violated the terms of the neutrality agreement." I am not opposing neutrality. I am only saying that if I were in charge of it when we leave the islands I would leave under such conditions that we would not be in danger of becoming involved in war.

At another place the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] asked this question:

What is your suggestion with relation to any protectorate or any agreement with other nations with respect to the neutrality of the Philippines?

Mr. MARTIN. I would do anything I could for the benefit of the Philippine Islands, but when we leave I would leave bag and baggage.

Mr. President, it has seemed to me that great benefit would result to the United States by reason of our possession of the Philippine Islands if we could say to the world some day, "We once took a weak people, gave them strength, and let them go." Nobody knows now whether this is possible or not. But if the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is adopted, or any amendment that gives the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands their independence within the next four years, we may safely conclude that the American lives which have been sacrificed in the islands and the money which has been expended there will go for naught; the most interesting experiment in history, the most laudable and honorable in history, will fail. And what may be much worse, if we quit now the world will say that we quit to save money or because we were afraid to remain.

I regret that the party responsible for this legislation, the framers and proposers of the committee report, have so suddenly changed their position, and I am wondering if history is again to repeat itself and a wise and safe disposition of a most important question is to be abandoned because the party responsible for this bill, at some time in the past, made promises to do an unwise and an unsafe thing.

It is true that the bill as reported by the committee is not in accord with Democratic platform promises. The first time I read the bill after it was referred to the committee it seemed to me that it was in direct harmony with Republican promises and pledges to the Filipinos and directly contrary to Democratic pledges.

President McKinley, in 1900, in Chicago, said:

The War with Spain was undertaken, not that the United States should increase its territory, but that oppression at our very doors should be stopped. This noble sentiment must continue to animate us and we must give to the world the full demonstration of the sincerity of our purpose.

If President McKinley meant anything in 1900, he meant precisely what the committee bill means. Step by step we must do our best to prepare the Filipinos for independence, and when prepared, or after they have had a fair and reasonable chance to prepare, we may honorably let them go. I was congratulating myself that the Democratic Party had abandoned its mistaken views expressed in 1900, and I hoped that nothing would be found in any Democratic platform that would compel the majority to turn from the path of safety and wisdom.

It is true that in 1900 the Democratic platform denounced our occupation of the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico as an act of criminal aggression and Democratic orators accused President McKinley of imperialistic ambitions, but now a Democratic President and those in authority in the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico can not find words strong enough to express their approval of the work done there. I might say, in passing, that if the same high purposes had been accorded to President McKinley in 1900 that are accorded to him now many precious lives would have been saved.

President Wilson, in his message to Congress in 1913, in discussing this matter, referring to our island possessions, said:

These are all matters of vital domestic concern, and besides them, outside the charmed circle of our own national life in which our affections command us, as well as our consciences, there stand our obligations toward our territories overseas. Here we are trustees. Porto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, are ours, indeed, but not ours to do what we please with. Such territories, once regarded as mere possessions, are no longer to be selfishly exploited; they are part of the domain of public conscience and of serviceable and enlightened statesmanship. We must administer them for the people who live in them and with the same sense of responsibility to them as toward our own people in our domestic affairs. No doubt we shall successfully enough bind Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands to ourselves by ties of justice and interest and affection, but the performance of our duty toward the Philippines is a more difficult and debatable matter. We can satisfy the obligations of generous justice toward the people of Porto Rico by giving them the ample and familiar rights and privileges accorded our own citizens in our own Territories and our obligations toward the people of Hawaii by perfecting the provisions for self-government already granted them, but in the Philippines we must go further. We must hold steadily in view their ultimate independence, and we must move toward the time of that independence as steadily as the way can be cleared and the foundations thoughtfully and permanently laid.

Acting under the authority conferred upon the President by Congress, I have already accorded the people of the islands a majority in both houses of their legislative body by appointing five instead of four native citizens to the membership of the commission. I believe that in this way we shall make proof of their capacity in counsel and their sense of responsibility in the exercise of political power, and that the success of this step will be sure to clear our view for the steps which are to follow. Step by step we should extend and perfect the system of self-government in the islands, making test of them and modifying them as experience discloses their successes and their failures; that we should more and more put under the control of the native citizens of the archipelago the essential instruments of their life, their local instrumentalities of government, their schools, all the common interests of their communities, and so by counsel and experience set up a government which all the world will see to be suitable to a people whose affairs are under their own control. At last, I hope and believe, we

are beginning to gain the confidence of the Filipino peoples. By their counsel and experience, rather than by our own, we shall learn how best to serve them and how soon it will be possible and wise to withdraw our supervision. Let us once find the path and set out with firm and confident tread upon it and we shall not wander from it or linger upon it.

I had hoped that this vindication of the Republican control of the islands and our purposes in going there and our purpose in remaining there was as sincere as it is well deserved.

Of course I could not forget that in 1900 the same platform that denounced our occupation of the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico as an act of criminal aggression also denounced the gold standard, and that the candidate of the Democratic Party in 1900 had two missions in life, one to free the Philippine islanders and one to free silver and save mankind from crucifixion upon a cross of gold. Fortunately he failed in both. We all agree to that now. Certainly we all agree that it was fortunate that he failed in his determination to abolish the gold standard. This is evidenced by the fact that the Democratic Party in the last campaign claimed all the credit for the wise protection thrown around the gold standard in the new Federal banking act. But I tremble when I recall the fact that the Federal reserve act was greatly marred, and I think largely deprived of its ultimate usefulness, because somebody at the eleventh hour discovered a plank in the Democratic platform which compelled Democratic Senators to vote against a single central bank, a system that would have been free from the domination of political appointees, and which would probably have done business enough to pay running expenses. I was sorry, and I think a great many Democrats were sorry, that the Democratic platform stood in the way of a single-bank system, admitted by all economists to be the best system.

But, Mr. President, not only on the Philippine question and the money question but on many other important questions we find the Democratic Party entering the Republican sanctuary to scoff but later on indicating that they would be glad to remain and join in the hymns did not some Democratic convention creed prohibit it.

I think it may fairly be said that such has been the rule with regard to the treatment of Republican policies by the Democratic Party. First, violent denunciation, then painful uncertainty and symptoms of remorse, then quiet imitation, and then proud adoption if its platforms would permit. The tariff question, by far the most important of all, may be said to be an exception, but even now there are ominous signs that the Democratic Party will claim all the rewards for the discovery of the tariff-commission idea, with all that it promises for the protection of our industrial independence.

But how may we hope that after the new Democratic commission has been created and the Democratic orators in the North have promised protection, as they always do; after the Democratic tariff commission and the Democratic orators have done their election-day duty—how can we hope that the Democratic platforms declaring protection to be unconstitutional, unjust, and undemocratic will not in the future, as in the past, recall and rebid Democracy to the fatal policy of a "tariff for revenue only."

Mr. President, I do not say that this unwise change of front on the part of the majority with regard to the pending measure, this abandonment of a unanimous committee report, is due to a sudden revival of a lost love for platform promises, but I do say that the Clarke amendment is in harmony with Democratic promises and the committee bill is not, and that no other reason of any force has been assigned for this sudden reversion to Democratic platform promises.

It has been urged that we may as well quit the Philippines now as 20 or 30 years from now because it is the edict of history and experience that an ignorant and untrained people can not learn the art of self-government from the bottom up in anything less than centuries of time. My answer is that history presents no experiment that is not the precise opposite of the one we are trying in the Philippines. The South American countries which have been cited as examples for our discouragement all obtained their independence from a despot, and history tells us that the leaders in these new republics either could not maintain order at all or they themselves endeavored to set up Republican despotisms, which are the worst variety known. The South American countries were compelled to learn the art of self-control in the school of assassination and war and hatred, and of course it took centuries, but it does not follow that it would take centuries for the Filipinos to learn to maintain order and good will where peace and good will only are taught. It generally takes a long time for boys of any race to learn good habits where only bad habits are taught, and a very short time for them to learn good habits where only good habits are taught. It is the universal opinion that the Filipinos are not a warlike people.

On the contrary, they are by instinct lovers of peace, and they are quick to adopt wise customs and habits.

Gen. Gordon—"Chinese Gordon," as he is called—speaks thus of the Philippine troops who formed a part of his forces in the China war:

They are a fine, sturdy body of fellows, faithful and long suffering, bearing hardships without murmurs, plucky and never losing heart in defeat, and considerably superior to the Japanese.

I think Gen. Gordon was a fair judge of human nature in the East.

Sir John Browning, who was consul general at Manila for a great many years, a most impartial witness and whose testimony is indorsed by Dean Worcester, said with regard to the Filipinos:

Rarely is an intertropical people a satisfactory one to eye or mind. But this can not be said of the Philippine Malay, who, in bodily formation and mental characteristics alike, may fairly claim a place, not among the middle ones merely, but among the higher names inscribed upon the world's national scale. He is characterized by a concentrated, never-absent self-respect; an habitual self-restraint in word and deed, very rarely broken, except when extreme provocation induces the transitory but fatal frenzy known as "amuck"; an inbred courtesy, equally diffused through all classes, high or low; by unflinching decorum, prudence, caution, quiet, cheerfulness, ready hospitality, and a correct though not inventive taste. His family is a pleasing sight—much subordination and little constraint; unison in gradation; liberty, not license; orderly children, respected parents; women subject but not oppressed; men ruling but not despotic; reverence with kindness; obedience in affection—these form a lovable picture by no means rare in the villages of the eastern isles.

And, again, Ramon Lala, himself of native birth, in his recent work on the Philippines, says:

All the people are born musicians; even little boys and girls of 5 or 6 years of age play the harp, the guitar, or the piano as if by instinct, while their elders show a proficiency that, when their opportunities are considered, is truly astonishing.

We are told what men are fit for who have no music in their souls. I do not see why we may not expect a capacity for peace and a love of justice in a people who have nothing but music in their souls.

It is my belief that a very few years more would be sufficient to save the Filipinos from themselves. It is possible that they could succeed if abandoned now, but it is doubtful. Ten to 15 years more, however, would, in my opinion, give them a start that they would maintain. Ten to 15 years more of generous treatment on our part would find them with a generation of mature men whose influence would leaven the whole lump. The experiment up to date has met with unexpected success. Certainly we need not quit now because we fear the experiment will fail.

Another reason assigned in support of the substitute is that the Filipinos have an inalienable right to liberty—an inalienable right to work out their own salvation. The word "liberty" is an attractive word, but we know that there are as many kinds of liberty as there are liquids, and their effect upon the human system is about as varied. And we know that the price of the only kind of liberty worth having is sacrifice and bondage to the law. The Mexicans are enjoying the kind that we may give to the Filipinos if the Clarke amendment is adopted. The Mexicans are now exercising their inalienable right to work out their own salvation in the school of murder, arson, and rapine. It can not be done. Where both sides are wrong, both sides must stop and cool off before either side can learn anything worth knowing. Two cutthroats fighting over a stolen purse are not learning the art of self-control. When we substituted our sovereignty for that of Spain, we became morally obligated to keep the peace, and we are not depriving the Filipinos of their inalienable rights when we are honestly trying to teach them how to save their inalienable rights.

Still another reason assigned for the immediate abandonment of the islands is that the retention of the islands constitutes a grave military danger. We took possession of the Hawaiian Islands and Guam Island because they would be of great strategic value in the event of war. Guam is nearer to Tokyo than Tokyo is to Manila. If Japan should desire to make us trouble in the Philippines, our fleet operating from Guam would be nearer to Japan's heart than she would be to the tip end of our tail.

Let us reverse the situation. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways. Suppose that Japan owned 100,000 square miles of land on the Mexican coast and the Hawaiian Islands and another island midway between San Francisco and Honolulu. Would we consider those possessions by Japan a grave military weakness for Japan? If so, why are we struck dumb with terror every time it is hinted that Japan is trying to get a naval station on the coast of Mexico?

The fact is we are afraid of Japan. Japan knows it and enjoys the situation. I give Japan credit for possessing ordinary common sense. And, furthermore, no nation in history has a

better record for keeping her word than Japan. She is now helping her English ally because she agreed to. Japan feels that she should be treated as an equal by us because she is in some ways our superior. There is an economic reason why the Japanese should not be allowed to come to this country, and if our statesmen on the Pacific coast would treat that question with tact and fairness I think it could be settled quickly and satisfactorily to all parties.

When the Japanese cruiser *Asama* was in the Pacific trying to help England overhaul a German cruiser she ran aground in Turtle Bay. The Sacramento press closed its eyes to the truth and announced to the world in red ink and large type that Japan had captured Turtle Bay, mined the approaches to the harbor, and landed 4,000 Japanese soldiers under the convoy of five of her largest battleships. It was, of course, untrue. But it is true that the Pacific coast did not think that Japan was getting land 7,000 miles away for the purpose of acquiring a military weakness.

How can we expect that Japan will respect us or fail to have all the fun she can at our expense if we persist in lying about her and her purposes? If we ever have a war with Japan, it will be due to our assumed superiority and that particular kind of pride which "goeth before a fall."

Mr. President, when this war is over Christian civilization must take an inventory of its assets, and if these assets are to include other things than oppression and hatred and greed, the United States must help furnish them. If the world ever expects to be led out of the wilderness of ignorance and cruelty the United States must point the way. To-day we are hated by the world. We are the international partner who is taking all the profits and sharing none of the losses. Our flag is a rag in Mexico and a dollar sign in Europe. This is unjust to us. We know it is unjust, but there is only one way in which we can establish our innocence. We have been preaching peace and good will to all men for 2,000 years. We must show our faith by our works or take down our sign. We have put our hands to this plow in the Philippine Islands, and we can not turn our back upon it now and escape the consequences. Our mission in the Philippines calls for courage, generosity, and unselfish devotion to the right as God gives us to see the right. If we remain steadfast we will light a candle in the East that will never go out.

Let us quit taking counsel of our fears and be Americans and do our duty. Japan is now at war with several great military powers. She will certainly wait until she knows the result of that war before she begins one that would mean disaster to her in the end. She does not like us, because she thinks we have been caustic and boorish in our treatment of her; but she knows that, provincial and impolite as we may seem to be, we would fight to the last ditch and cripple her for good if she forced us to defend our national integrity.

There is no good reason why we should abandon the greatest and grandest philanthropy in history through fear that Japan or any other nation will interfere with us. We may easily invite ridicule and hostile demonstrations if we leave this great and noble work half done because we are afraid somebody else with an ignoble purpose will make us trouble. And we can excite the admiration and support of the world by taking the position that nothing will frighten us away from a righteous cause.

I am for peace and I am for having all the tools necessary to defend peace, but when I try to look into the future I see nothing but wars and rumors of wars as long as a national conscience is admitted to be an impossibility. If we pass this bill as it came from the committee we will demonstrate to the world the sincerity of our purposes in the Philippines, and we will clearly indicate to the world that we have renounced the doctrine that "might makes right." We will set an example that other nations must follow some time if humanity ever expects to rescue itself from the fangs of war and injustice.

If the President has changed his mind and is now advocating the Clarke amendment because he has inside information that the retention of the islands will hazard our peace with other nations, the Committee on Foreign Relations should be informed, and that committee should take the matter in hand in conjunction with the Committee on the Philippines and a substitute should be prepared that will meet the situation safely and quickly.

If the President is simply following the lead of those Senators who are for the Clarke substitute because it is historically democratic, I desire to say that this is a most inopportune time for such a radical change of front. International conditions are now such that any attempt to operate the provisions in the substitute offered by the Senator from Arkansas, in so far as

they seek to secure the assistance of other nations, will be fruitless.

If the substitute is adopted, and disturbances should arise in the islands at any time within the four-year period, other nations would be much more likely to interfere than if we leave things as they now are. If this substitute should be adopted, it would be very easy for any foreign nation to start an insurrection in the islands. Ten thousand dollars would do it. The different factions would probably invite assistance from the outside. The United States, resenting the ingratitude manifested by the inhabitants of the islands, would probably be compelled to interfere, and a deplorable condition would be possible.

I thoroughly agree with Gov. Martin and others who are, and have been, in a position to wisely analyze the situation. When we quit we should quit "bag and baggage," and the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, which gives the Filipinos independence after they have voted in favor of it, which, of course, they would do immediately, is far preferable to the substitute offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

If we are going to cross this bridge now, let us cross it and be sure that it is safe while we are on it, and not try to jump a river the opposite shores of which are invisible.

Right in line with the Clarke amendment is the prohibition amendment, which was hastily and, I think, unwisely adopted the other day. That amendment excepts native drinks and permits their use. It was admitted that native drinks contain much more alcohol than those imported. It is very clear to me that the gentlemen interested in the traffic will change the labels on the bottles from "whisky" to "vino," and the amendment will be a dead letter. Some slight adulterations may be necessary to enable the supreme court of the islands to arrive at a satisfactory distinction between native drinks and imported drinks, but the sole effect of the amendment will be to deprive the Philippine treasury of \$2,000,000 a year in revenues.

The intentions of the Senators who voted for the prohibitory amendment were of the best, and the intentions of those advocating the Clarke substitute for the committee bill may be of the best; but when we are dealing with matters which affect the vital interests of 8,000,000 people we should know what we are doing, and if we do not know, we should either find out or let well enough alone.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to have printed certain amendments which I propose to offer to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, that course will be pursued. The amendments submitted by Mr. HITCHCOCK are as follows:

Amendments intended, to be proposed by Mr. HITCHCOCK to the amendment proposed by Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas to the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, viz:

Page 1, on line 9, after the word "government," insert the words "republican in form."

Page 1, on line 10, after the word "thereof," insert the words "by peaceful means."

Page 2, on line 3, strike out "date of the approval of" and insert the words "first meeting of the legislature provided for in."

Page 2, on line 9, after the word "doing," insert the words "or that the interests of the United States so require."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "at," insert the words "any time before."

Page 3, line 3, after the word "States," insert the words "and of other countries."

Page 3, line 7, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

Page 3, line 10, after the word "Philippines," add the following: "The President shall also require the Philippine Government so recognized and established to assume all of the obligations in the Philippines incurred by the United States under the treaty of Paris."

Page 3, line 11, strike out the words "immediately upon" and insert "within four years after."

Page 3, line 24, strike out the last word and all the remainder of the proposed amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Harding	Martine, N. J.	Stone
Brandegge	Hitchcock	Myers	Sutherland
Bryan	Hollis	Nelson	Swanson
Catron	Husting	Norris	Tillman
Chilton	Jones	Overman	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Page	Vardaman
Colt	La Follette	Polindexter	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lane	Shafroth	Walsh
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Weeks
Dillingham	Lewis	Smith, Ga.	
Fletcher	McCumber	Smoot	
Gore	McLean	Sterling	

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. Goff] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have responded to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 29, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We wait upon Thee, our Father in heaven, in the sacred attitude of prayer, for inspiration and guidance that with clear vision, high ideals, and patriotic endeavors the work of the hour may be well pleasing in Thy sight and redound to the good of our beloved country. Our minds instinctively turn to-day to one of our martyred Presidents, whose untimely death cast a gloom of sorrow and regret throughout the land. A patriot, a soldier, a statesman, may his work live and ever be an inspiration to men of every creed, of every party, of every calling in life. Blessed be his memory.

And, O God, our heavenly Father, we pray that our President may be protected from violence and the dangers which attend him on his mission throughout the country, that he may return in safety to take up the great problems which confront us and bring them to a happy solution. And Thy name shall be praised forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 10385) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Rept. 87), which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] reserves all points of order on the bill.

PERSONAL STATEMENT.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHALL. My friends, I am feeling pretty proud this morning, because through your kindness I now have a page who devotes himself to my personal service. During a recess of the Immigration Committee, whose sessions I have been attending continuously since Wednesday, I was startled when Mrs. Schall read to me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the House had passed a resolution pertaining to me, by which I have been given the services of a page. The thoughtful, big-hearted gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], unsolicited and unexpected by me, offered this resolution, and the kindly spirited leader of our side [Mr. MANN] assisted in securing unanimous consent for its consideration, so that I now have the privilege of the services of this page; and I want to say to you gentlemen that I am deeply grateful, because this is only another manifestation of the courtesy and consideration which I have received from everyone since I have been here. To the blind man work is his pleasure. Whatever extends his usefulness widens his enjoyment. By giving me the means of doing more work you have expanded my pleasure, and released me from bondage, and given me a freedom which expands my heart. The helping hands stretched out to me along the way and the cheering voices which come to me from the dark are the inspirations which make bright the otherwise gray days and give me a renewed zest and make life worth the fight. Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth. I have often wished that He had not loved me quite so much; but you know Robert Louis Stevenson says that so long as a man has a friend he is not useless; and I find that I have many friends in this House, and through their kindness in giving me the services of this page they have com-

joined to augment my usefulness. I want to thank you, gentlemen, and perhaps I may be permitted to say to my friends with full pride that—

In the fell clutch of circumstance
I have not winced nor cried aloud;
Under the bludgeonings of chance
My head is bloody but unbowed,
And all the menace of the years
Finds and shall find me unafraid.

It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul.

[Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3144. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, bill of the following title:

H. R. 8235. An act to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of International High Commission.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 3144. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution for repair and rebuilding of the levee at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PORTO RICO.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for the island of Porto Rico may be given a privileged status. I want to say, if I may be permitted, that this is practically the bill which was unanimously reported from the Committee on Insular Affairs in the Sixty-third Congress, and that it was found impossible to get consideration for it in the House in that Congress. We have again reported this bill unanimously, and the committee are very desirous that it shall be passed by the House before the anticipated congestion comes, because it is exceedingly important to the people of Porto Rico that this bill be passed.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I hope no one on this side will object. This bill does not involve any questions except purely those which relate to the administrative government of Porto Rico. As the chairman of the committee has said, the bill is reported unanimously. It has been considered without partisanship. While, of course, there may be some changes made in it upon the floor of the House, there is nothing in it that will, in my judgment, embarrass the progress of business or in any way raise any political question.

Let me say further that the matters in the bill have been so well discussed and thrashed out in the consideration of the bill by the committee, in the last Congress and in this Congress, that, in my judgment, it will take very little time in the House. I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that this bill be given a privileged status. Of course that would have to yield to appropriation bills, revenue bills, and things of that sort. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, let us understand just what the expression "privileged status" means. I think the usual request has been to give a bill the status of a bill reported from a committee which has the right to report at any time, with the understanding that it will not interfere with appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER. The Chair added the condition that it should not interfere with appropriation bills or revenue bills, so there could be no mistake about it.

Mr. JONES. Even if we had the right to do so, it is not the purpose of the committee to interfere with the consideration of appropriation bills. We will certainly not call up the bill without first conferring with gentlemen who have charge of appropriation measures, because we would not want, in any event, to antagonize any measure of that sort.

The SPEAKER. Of course the exception includes Calendar Wednesday and also the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

Mr. MANN. The usual request is to give a bill the privilege of a bill reported from a committee which has the right to report at any time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not want this bill or any other bill to get in ahead of revenue bills or appropriation bills, so far as the Chair is individually concerned.

Mr. MANN. I think it is quite safe to say that the House would not take up this bill ahead of any such bill.

Mr. JONES. I certainly will not ask that it be taken up ahead of any such bill, and we only ask that it be made privileged under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for the island of Porto Rico be given the status of bills reported from committees having the right to report and call up bills at any time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the speeches to be delivered to-day under special orders have been concluded the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] be allowed 45 minutes to address the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] may have 45 minutes in which to address the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD Secretary Lansing's last note to Great Britain covering the question of seizure of mails and parcel post and the tentative reply of Great Britain thereto; also an editorial opinion in the London Evening Mail on the question of neutral rights.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a note of the Secretary of State to Great Britain on the seizure of the mails and also the tentative note from Great Britain to our Government, and an editorial comment on the matter in the London Mail. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Ohio if he will please eliminate the printing of the editorial.

Mr. FESS. If it is necessary for me to have the request granted, I will.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say that the custom of printing newspaper editorials of all sorts and magazine extracts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of late years made the RECORD so voluminous that there has been a diligent effort on the part of the Printing Committee and House leaders to eliminate as much of such matter as possible. While I dislike to object, I believe I shall have to do so if the editorial is to accompany the notes. I have no objection to the others. The gentleman can get the editorial in the way of extension of remarks, and there are other ways by which he can get in the newspaper extract.

Mr. FESS. My only desire at this time is to link up with our controversy an opinion which I think is very specific in the London Evening Mail. Of course I will withdraw that if the gentleman is inclined to object to it, but I think the matter ought to be in the RECORD.

Mr. BARNHART. The only difficulty about the matter is that if this is permitted probably to-morrow some other Member may be on the floor asking for unanimous consent to print an editorial in opposition, and then some other Member another, and so it will go. I think the gentleman from Ohio can see the difficulty.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman from Indiana object if I made the request to extend remarks in which I will include these articles?

Mr. BARNHART. I should have no objection to the gentleman extending his remarks. A Member of the House has that right, but I should object to extending remarks for the mere purpose of including a newspaper editorial.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I will change the request so that I may extend my remarks, and include in my remarks the Secretary of State's note to Great Britain, Great Britain's reply, and this editorial, which is an English editorial. I would not ask it if it was an American editorial.

Mr. BARNHART. I object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the conclusion of the other special orders already entered for to-day the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETS] have leave to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS] may address the House for 40 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PREPAREDNESS.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order for to-day the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 10 additional minutes. I do not know that I shall want to use it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his time be extended from 20 to 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], seized with sudden war hysteria, made a remarkable speech on the propaganda of preparedness. In his remarks he conjured up a terrible dread of an attack upon our country by some foe across the waters, and said that the conflict in Europe would probably last many years while the opposing forces are rapidly destroying one another. If his latter remark is true and the warring nations are being destroyed by this terrible conflict, common sense refutes his fear of danger to our people from invading European armies. This attack against us will not come. England desires our friendship and Germany wishes to retain it. Both these warring nations will not abandon their land and homes to cross the ocean and attack America. Each well knows that this course would leave either country open to attack and ravage by the other while engaged in war here with America. No one really believes that those countries, now becoming exhausted, their armies and navies being reduced to a minimum, are planning to attack us. In the present conflict those countries are crippling and destroying their resources for more than half a century, and must for that period remain helpless to menace us with war.

AGAINST A LARGE STANDING ARMY.

The gentleman, reaching the height of his hysteria, cries out for an Army of 250,000, 300,000—aye, for half a million men. Let me say democracy does not want such an Army and will not tolerate this demand. In my judgment, such plans of militarism have no sanction in the minds and hearts of our people. True, they demand a force for adequate defense. Who will oppose a small addition to the Regular Army for use in times of peace? We should all stand ready to develop the National Guard. Who will object to adequate methods of training officers and providing reserve officers?

Mr. Speaker, I declare myself opposed to this plan of the leader of the Republican Party in the House for a large standing Army, entailing the expenditure of billions of dollars. Democracy has never tolerated this doctrine of militarism thus pressed by the gentleman from Illinois. The Democratic Party never will embrace his wild proposal. It is abhorrent to the ideals of democracy and the genius of our republican institutions. In a recent speech by the distinguished Representative, Mr. DAVIS of Texas, who through a lifetime has defended the rights of the taxpayers and toilers, he foresaw and forewarned the people of the designs of the Republican leaders and war traffickers to burden the country with a stupendous military program.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the Republican leaders and war trust masters are most ambitious for an era of militarism of vast proportions. It is natural for the Republican leaders to feel kindly toward the great trusts. They are the children of the Republican household. They were nurtured and fed by that party till they have become giants. They seek now to praise the President and the party in power while they betray it into the hands of the war traffickers as they magnify the stocks of their friends and allies profiting by their actions. They design to destroy democracy and return to the rule of the trusts.

AMERICA MUST BE NEUTRAL.

Mr. Speaker, this country has confidence in the integrity of purpose and patriotism of the President. It believes he is truly seeking the ways of peace. More than a year ago he warned all Americans to remain neutral in the awful contest across the seas. His warning was wise, and all who love this country should heed it, and I believe most Americans have heeded it. All Americans of whatever race, descent, and extraction should occupy a position of neutrality, but the gentleman from Illinois sounds a discordant note, and his remarks gravely imperil neutrality. Recently the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] undertook to array us against Germany and paraded

that Empire before us as an immediate menace and danger to America. In an unwarrantable attack against German-Americans he sought to destroy our thoughts and acts of neutrality. Let us hope that we have heard the last of this and other deplorable and inexcusable assaults by Representatives against the German-American citizens.

FOR AN EMBARGO ON ARMS AND AMMUNITION.

And now comes the great Republican leader, Mr. MANN, and in deliberate and measured words shouts in our ears: "I have much more fear, in the end, of war with England than I have of war with Germany!" Ah, Mr. Speaker, what does his fear, if true, portend? It means that this country, realizing its duty, should place an embargo on the exportation of arms and ammunition and prevent their shipment beyond our limits. I am ready to vote for it to-day, and if the gentleman from Illinois speaks with authority, we should hasten the hour. If we must fight England, let us keep our arms and ammunition at home. [Applause.] Stop the exportation of this deadly traffic, amounting to millions and billions of dollars. If England is to attack us, it is treason to further strengthen her forces from our factories. If he prophesies rightly, must America sit idly by while the J. Pierpont Morgan Syndicate, the money changers, the war trust masters, and their ramifying institutions equip England with modern arms and guns and billions of dollars with which to turn and destroy us as a Republic? No, Mr. Speaker; a thousand times no! Rather let us quickly pass an embargo act. Inexorable logic points the way and forces us to that conclusion. Let us stop the shipment of arms and ammunition to England by proper embargo, restrain the flow of our millions of money to them, and thus diminish their power to destroy us, if we must fight them, as the gentleman from Illinois thinks.

THE PROPOSED BILLION-DOLLAR LOAN TO THE ALLIES.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Senator JAS. HAMILTON LEWIS, was right when he protested against the billion-dollar loan to the allies. He said it was unneutral and unwise, and thus took a brave, patriotic, and justifiable stand. I commended him then and congratulate him now on his glorious American spirit. The loan was scaled to half a billion dollars, and I am proud to note that the Morgan Syndicate met difficulties and the loan went below par and was far from being a success. The money and credit of the American people should never be used for such an unholy purpose. In supreme degree such acts are unneutral. By them our citizens become stockholders in that bloody carnival of war, and are thus interested, prejudiced, and made partisans for the warring allies of Europe. It is an unjustifiable thing for Americans to do. And if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is right, having supplied them with money, allowed the War Trust masters to furnish them guns and ammunition, now England is to cross the ocean and fight us with our own resources. If such be the case, the J. Pierpont Morgan Syndicate, the money trust and the war trust masters, have committed a crime against their own country by equipping and supplying an enemy to advance on us. Let this miserable traffic cease. We should no longer fill the maw of the war trust, but pray and hope for peace across the waters.

OUR RIGHTS AS A NATION TO TRADE WITH BELLIGERENTS IN COTTON AND FOODSTUFFS.

And at this point permit me to say that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] are right in their contentions, resolutions, and bills touching our rights as a neutral nation to trade with belligerents in cotton and foodstuffs, and I shall heartily support their measures. By her orders in council, her embargoes, interference with our mails, and unlawful acts England has injured our legitimate commerce in cotton and foodstuffs, and we should find a way by retaliatory enactment and otherwise to require her to vacate those proceedings and restore our lawful trade and respect our rights. It is the duty of Congress to move by resolution or law and furnish relief to our farmers and producers, whose rights have been unjustly and illegally violated by England. By my voice and vote I am ready to assert our cause and defend it through the authority of the American Congress. Let us begin by hastening a bill to prohibit the exportation of arms and ammunition in addition to what the patriotic Senators from Georgia and Oklahoma are endeavoring to accomplish. Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us hurry the passage of the ship-purchase bill. *Our farmers want cotton ships and want them now.* Their cargoes are tied up and held in our home ports. We should release them and furnish our country a merchant marine to hasten this commerce abroad. The golden opportunity is here, and we should embrace it by the immediate enactment of the Alexander ship-purchase bill and furnish an abundance of cotton ships and vessels for all kinds of lawful commerce.

OUR GERMAN-AMERICAN CITIZENS.

Mr. Speaker, to-day permit me to state my refusal to join in the invidious acrimony indulged in by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and those acting with him against our German-American citizens. Coming from a State where many men of German birth and descent reside, I am justified in bearing testimony on the floor of this House to their worth. Having resided amongst them, keeping in communication with them, and knowing their ambitions and ideals, I do not hesitate to commend their loyalty and patriotism. It is not strange that their hearts are thrilled and torn with passion and feelings of grief and emotion when their minds go across the waters to contemplate the horrors of bloody battle fields in Europe. They think and dream of their ancestral homes and the kindred left there as the souls of their people are wafted to eternity on the smoke of the bloody battle grounds. Mr. Speaker, is it strange that their minds dwell on these things and that their hearts are there with their kindred? And thus we may view the natives and descendants of any race of people from any land. In our hearts we must make just allowance for their thoughts, emotions, and actions. I shall not now or hereafter sympathize with these attacks on the German-Americans of our country, but repel them.

Mr. Speaker, by the votes of Texas constituencies two great German-Americans sat as Representatives on this floor, Hon. Gustave Schleicher and Hon. Rudolph Kleberg. They reflected credit upon the imperial State of Texas and brought honor to that Commonwealth. Their people mingled their blood with Texan-Americans and produced a noble strain of manhood. We are proud of that commingled blood, and I assert to-day that there is no nobler type of citizenship anywhere than the German-Americans of Texas. In business they are models of honor, industry, and success; in farm life their homes become the charm and admiration of the countryside. As law-abiding citizens they are unsurpassed and perhaps unequaled by any race of people. Inhabiting vast areas of Texas, richer than the Valley of the Nile and more beautiful than the Vale of Cashmere, they have made my native State blossom as the rose. They have brought wealth, happiness, contentment, and unbounded prosperity to our people.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, the leader of his party in the House, proclaims that he has "much more fear, in the end, of war with England than of war with Germany." Let us pray that it may not come with England or with any country, but if it must come from England or any other foe, when our towns are bombarded and our land invaded you will find the German-Americans under our flag in the very front of battle locking arms and joining step with native Americans, with the Irish, the Dane, the Bohemian, the Italian, the Swede, the Jew, and those of English ancestry as well. [Applause.] Texas will furnish 50,000 German-American youths to save our honor and preserve our country. They will be found intensely loyal in the service of America. If war with England or any other nation must come, in common with all Americans the German-Americans will proudly carry the honor of their country into battle and contribute to repeat our victories of Kings Mountain, New Orleans, and many bloody fields of battle when the crest of England was laid low by our arms. [Applause.]

AGAINST STAMP TAXES AND FOR INCREASING THE INCOME TAX.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois and those acting with him are to force upon this country a vast standing army and the hateful doctrine of militarism, we must take account of the method of raising the money by taxation to meet their demands. As for me, I am against odious stamp taxes and think they should be repealed and should not be repeated. [Applause on the Republican side.] Further excise taxes at this time should be eschewed, and we should quickly amend our income-tax laws and extend their provisions and lay the burdens of taxation and great preparedness programs upon the backs of the wealthy. Now will you applaud? When gentlemen on that side of the aisle are brought face to face with a provision to increase the income tax they are as silent as the tomb. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Democratic Party is entitled to the confidence and support of the country for passing an income-tax measure which has been held constitutional by the Supreme Court and is now in full flower of efficiency and should be utilized to supply the needs of the Treasury. If \$80,000,000 from this source is insufficient to meet our present demands, let us double the tax and treble it and force those who enjoy the benefits of good government to contribute their just share of the burden.

And, again, Mr. Speaker, I would levy a tax on the manufacturers of arms and munitions of war, who ship enormous quantities of their products abroad. Their wealth is increased; they are prospering beyond computation and gathering billions

of gains, and should immediately bear their part of the increased taxes. They are making immense profits. Mr. Speaker, the way is open, the income-tax law is valid under the Constitution, and in this generation we should turn our thoughts to the consumer, the producer, and overburdened taxpayer and lift the load from his shoulders and place it upon those who are coining billions in war profits, who are piling their wealth to mountain heights, in many instances with ill-gotten gains, and go forward as a great Republic perpetuating equality before the law for every man. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARD). Under the special order the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] is recognized for 40 minutes.

WILLIAM M'KINLEY.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, seventy-three years ago to-day William McKinley was born in the little village of Niles in the State of Ohio. He remained there until he was about 11 years of age and then moved with his parents to Poland, in the same State, where, as his mother once said, there were better educational advantages for the children. He entered Allegheny College, and when the war broke out—then but 18 years of age—enlisted as a private soldier. He was promoted several times during the war, and at its close returned home with the commission of a brevet major "for gallant and meritorious services at the Battles of Obequan, Cedar Creek, and Fishers Hill." This commission was signed by Abraham Lincoln about one month before his death. Maj. McKinley then took up the study of law. For a time he was in the law school at Albany, N. Y., and later, returning to his native State, was admitted to the bar, and began the practice of law in the city of Canton, which remained his home until his death. He was elected prosecuting attorney of Stark County in 1871, but was defeated for reelection in 1873. In 1876 he was first elected to Congress. In 1880 he was made a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, taking the place of Gen. Garfield, who at that time had just been elected President. In 1889 he became the chairman of that great committee which drafted the McKinley tariff law. In 1890 he was defeated for Congress and in 1891 he was elected governor of Ohio. In 1893 he was reelected. In 1896 he was elected President of the United States. In 1900 he was reelected. On the 6th day of September, 1901, while attending the exposition at Buffalo, he was shot by an assassin, and there lingered between life and death until the 14th, when he died. This briefly is a sketch of his life.

AN INSPIRING CAREER.

His was an inspiring career. Every phase of it has something worthy of emulation and hope to American youth and manhood. It would be pleasant to retrace the steps of his early boyhood and picture the American home from which he sprang; his early school life and the building of character; his participation in the debates, where he acquired that simplicity and directness of speech which, with a well-modulated voice and a strong earnestness and fervency of expression, made him later one of the most impressive orators of his time. I would like to dwell upon his career as a soldier; the brilliant achievements upon the field; that dramatic incident when, in the flame of battle, amid flying shot and bursting shell, he bore the order of his colonel, afterwards President of the United States, to a distant regiment. And then, too, when Sheridan, on his immortal ride down the valley of the Shenandoah, found him rallying his men, the first to meet him and state definitely the military situation. I would like to relate his struggles as a young lawyer waiting for clients, and later his success at the bar, and his ability as a prosecutor before the courts of Stark County. I would like to speak of him as the citizen, loyal and true, and then as the man, his gentleness and his many amiable traits of character, and particularly his constant devotion to the invalid partner of his joys and sorrows. But time would fail me to speak of the many interesting sides of his life, and so I pass on to his national career.

From 1876 down to the day of his death he was in public life, as a Member of Congress, as governor of his State, and as President of the United States. For twenty-five years he stood in the blaze of the fierce light of public criticism, and there never was a whisper of suspicion as to his integrity, his honor, or character. [Applause.]

HIS INDUSTRY.

McKinley was industrious and concentrated all of his faculties to a given purpose. When he first entered public life he threw his whole soul and energy into it. He made it his business not only to be a good Member of Congress but to be the best Member of Congress that he knew how, and it is this difference between doing a thing well and doing a thing the best you know how that makes the difference between the ordinarily successful man

and the eminently successful man. The extra effort which is applied in the latter case has laid the foundation for the great characters in history.

CONCENTRATION OF ENERGIES.

Then, too, the proper concentration of efforts along a given line of action is infinitely better than the diffusion of energies over a whole field of labor, some of which may be profitable and some unprofitable.

McKinley, in one of his speeches, said:

Labor is the only key to opportunity. You are all here to do something—to work out a destiny, to discover the forces of nature and make them serve men's uses and God's purposes.

McKinley while in Congress directed his efforts largely in one direction. He sought to do something, and he found that something to be the mastery of a great political principle which he believed meant more for the happiness of the American people than anything else—protection to American industries. [Applause.] He applied himself day and night to that one thing until he became the master of this great idea.

THE MASTER OF A GREAT PRINCIPLE.

Some of his critics have said that he was a man of one idea, and that was the argument which was frequently used against him when he was nominated for President of the United States and in the campaign following. But it is better to be a master of one thing than to be a master of none. It is better, as Josh Billings once said, "to know less than so many things that ain't so." The men who have been great in history have been masters of an idea. It is written in the Holy Writ that if one is faithful over a few things he will be made ruler over many things. McKinley became a master of the great principle of protection, and linked his personality interchangeably with it, so that when the people of this country beheld him they saw, as it were, in him the principle for which he stood. When the dark hour of financial disaster, want, misery, and unhappiness came the people called unto this man as their only Moses to lead them out of the wilderness, and the master of one idea became the ruler of many. [Applause.] But some of his critics said: "Well, wait; you will find that he only knows one thing." And yet McKinley had acquired an ability to so concentrate his whole self upon the thing immediately before him that to every great emergency during his administration he proved himself more than equal.

The master of the tariff became the master of the currency and the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, the master mind of a war between this country and Spain.

POLITICAL HONESTY.

Another characteristic of McKinley was his political honesty. He was honest in his speech; he was honest in his action—he made the one square with the other.

One of the most striking incidents in American political life occurred in the Republican national convention in 1888, held in the city of Chicago. He had come to that convention as a delegate from the State of Ohio, instructed to cast his vote for John Sherman for President. When Sherman's success seemed impossible of realization some of McKinley's friends began to vote for him. Immediately he arose, and, standing upon a chair in the convention, made this speech, so typical of the man:

Mr. President and gentlemen of the convention, I am here as one of the chosen representatives of my State. I am here by resolution of the State Republican convention, passed without a single dissenting voice, commanding me to cast my vote for John Sherman for President and to use every worthy endeavor for his nomination. I accepted the trust because my heart and judgment were in accord with the letter and spirit and purpose of that resolution. It has pleased certain delegates to cast their votes for me as President. I am not insensible to the honor they would do me, but in the presence of the duty resting upon me I can not remain silent with honor. I can not consistently with the wish of the State whose credentials I bear, and which has trusted me; I can not with honorable fidelity to John Sherman, who has trusted me in his cause and with his confidence; I can not consistently with my own views of personal integrity consent, or seem to consent, to permit my name to be used as a candidate before this convention. I would not respect myself if I could find it in my heart to do so or permit to be done that which could even be ground for anyone to suspect that I wavered in my loyalty to Ohio or my devotion to the chief of her choice and the chief of mine. I do not request—I demand—that no delegate who would not cast reflection upon me shall cast a ballot for me.

[Applause.]

After McKinley made that short speech the eyes of the country became riveted upon him. Here was a type of a public man of which the country had seen too little, and from that hour he grew in popular esteem. The people had marked the man.

HIS LOYALTY TO PARTY PRINCIPLES.

Another characteristic of McKinley was his unflinching loyalty to party principle. When other men wavered he did not. When the McKinley bill became a law and the following election brought his party to defeat, loud and angry were the criticisms all over the country against him and the measure for

which he stood. But his only reply was that the people had not had time to understand the McKinley law, but they would see in it their salvation. McKinley at this time, in one of his speeches, said:

The friends of protection should not now falter. The fight is only begun. If temporarily lost, it is not to be given up. Courage was never more needed and never more expected by the people from the Representatives than now. It is the demand of the hour and the requirement of the situation.

He was loyal to the principle which he believed to be true, in defeat as well as in victory. The strongest test that comes to men is the test of loyalty to principle when seemingly engulfed in disaster, but the man who courageously stands by his guns will some day become the hero of the hour.

HIS TRUST IN THE PEOPLE.

McKinley was not only true to himself, but he was true to the people. It might be said of him, as he once said of Lincoln, that "he was of the people, for the people, but never above the people." In his speech upon the life of that great man (and does he not draw a picture even of himself) he said:

What were the traits of character which made Abraham Lincoln prophet and master, without a rival, in the greatest crisis of our history? What gave him such mighty power? To me the answer is simple—Lincoln had sublime faith in the people. He walked with and among them. He recognized the importance and power of an enlightened public sentiment and was guided by it.

HIS AMERICANISM.

McKinley was, above all things, an American. [Applause.] His whole life breathed the broad, true spirit of sterling Americanism; he was the product of the American home and was always true to it. He was the product of the American school and believed that education was one of the foundation stones of the Republic. He proved his title as an American patriot in the fierce blaze of war. He was the advocate, as I have said before, of protection to American industries. In a speech, delivered in Boston, he said:

Let England take care of herself; let France look after her interests; let Germany take care of her own people; but let Americans look after America.

[Applause.]

He believed in an Army and a Navy strong enough to protect American interests and American citizens on land and sea wherever they might be. [Applause.] In his last speech at Buffalo, in referring to our merchant marine, he said:

We must encourage our merchant marine; we must have more ships; they must be under the American flag, built, manned, and owned by Americans.

[Applause.]

He further declared in favor of building an Isthmian Canal to connect the two oceans, and also the construction of a cable to the Orient. He realized that the Spanish-American War had opened the door of enlarged responsibilities for us as a Nation; that it had made us a world power whether we liked it or not, and his great speech at Buffalo was undoubtedly his conception of the course which our Ship of State should sail on the larger sea of international opportunity.

FAITH IN GOD EXEMPLIFIED IN LIFE AND DEATH.

McKinley was a man of faith. He had faith in himself, faith in the people, and, above all, faith in God. He believed that nations as well as individuals were but the instruments of the Almighty's power and purpose. He believed that men were raised up in great national emergencies to meet the problems of the hour. He sought by earnest living and Christian prayer to keep himself so close to his Maker as to be ever receptive to the gentle droppings of Divine Will.

Great in life but magnificent in death. What artist in all the world can ever picture this Christian's death? When the assassin had accomplished his murderous intent his hand was raised to stay the angry people, and, with compassion for the wretch, he murmured, "Don't hurt him; God help him." And then the solicitude for his wife, "Don't tell her." And then, a week later, that last "Good-by—good-by, all; God's will, not ours, be done." Such a death immeasurably advanced the cause of Christianity.

HIS GREAT WORK.

He died just at the height of his career. He initiated policies on more important questions during his administration than any President since Lincoln, and he saw more of them accomplished; he saw the great doctrine which he had advocated all of his life become the law of the land; he saw the gold standard permanently established; he saw our country on a firmer financial basis and enjoying greater prosperity than it had ever known before; he saw our flag raised over Hawaii; he saw our Army and Navy victorious on the land and the sea; he saw Spanish tyranny stricken down on the island of Cuba and a new Republic come forth; he saw Porto Rico annexed to this country and

the Philippines ours—ours not for conquest but ours to hold as a sacred trust, for civilization, for liberty, and independence [applause]; he saw our Army lead the allied forces on to Peking and place our flag first above its walls. When international greed would have strangled the Chinaman and dismembered his Empire, he saw American justice, tempered with American mercy, call a halt, and he saw American diplomacy turn the allied forces back again. [Applause.] In the full tide of American prosperity, when American art, science, and industry were at their best, and when the American name was honored and respected the world over as never before, just at that time our President died; died in the fullness of his strength of mind and heart and soul; died when it seemed that everything called unto him to live and to enjoy; died under a Providence that is greater than our own, which only the Christian faith is able to reconcile to the human heart.

When McKinley fell the Nation wept. No President was ever nearer to the hearts of the people. There was no partyism in our national sorrow. While one great party claimed him as its own, yet his great career had long since overleaped the bounds of partisanship. There was no sectionalism in our national grief. When Lincoln died, at the close of the Civil War, time had not sufficed to unite the North and the South and but half the Nation mourned him; but when McKinley died all sections of our common country paid reverence and homage to him who had been the personal embodiment of reconciliation and reunion. At the hour of his funeral, for five full minutes all the activities of the land were hushed to silence. No greater tribute was ever paid to man.

The years have swiftly passed. Many more will come and go. Generation will follow generation, but in the far-off distant future when the recording angel of history, in the clear light of impartial truth, comes to write the names of those who wrought mightily for their country and their fellow men she will place high on the scroll of eternal fame the name of George Washington, the father of the Republic, and then beneath she will write the name of our martyred Lincoln, the preserver of the American Union, and then, dipping her pen once more in the blood of martyrdom, will inscribe the name of William McKinley, the beloved of Presidents, whose life and character through all the ages will be the synonym of the purest and highest Christian statesmanship. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By special order the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] was to have been recognized next, but an arrangement has been made whereby the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] is to come next. Is there objection to the recognition of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] at this time.

There was no objection.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address this House with considerable diffidence, because I have heard that it was a tradition of this body that young Members, like children, should be seen and not heard. But on yesterday, when I heard a most excellent speech from the gentleman from Texas, attacking, at least, if not directly, by innuendo, the fundamental necessity of preparedness as enunciated by the President, the leader of the party, and when I saw, furthermore, that no member of his own party rose to his defense, but that it remained for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], not of his political faith, very gallantly to couch his lance in defense and enter the lists, I said to myself: "Since I am a recent recruit from the body of the people, I will seek an opportunity to express to this House what I believe to be the thoughts and the ideas of at least a majority of the people of the fifth congressional district of Mississippi upon this question."

I think there has been much confusion of thought and much confusion of exposition by reason of the fact that in the discussion of this subject there have been linked together several unrelated subject matters. The necessity of preparedness is one question; the sources from which we are to get the revenue to carry a preparedness program into effect is another. The subject matters that shall be taxed is a question that is totally unrelated to the question of whether a necessity exists at all for further preparation on the part of this Government to protect itself in case of war. I think that in the discussion of these questions and in their decision, if not on the floor of this House at least in our own minds, we should consider them in their due order.

If we decide that there is no necessity for further preparation on the part of this Government to maintain American institutions and American rights, then the question of how the taxes shall be raised or should be raised becomes purely academic and theoretical. If, on the other hand, we do decide that a wise public policy, patriotism, and common sense and a learning of the lessons of the current events of the day demand that this

country should make further preparation, then there will arise for decision by this body the question as to how the revenue is to be raised.

Personally I am in hearty accord with the position taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] in his speech yesterday in that I think that money should be raised by taxing those things and those people who are best able to bear the burden. I think it is fundamentally just and right. I know it is the only practical method of carrying out the patriotic idea of putting this country in a state of so-called preparedness.

As I understand it, the gentleman from Texas spoke fundamentally on the question of whether or not there be any necessity whatsoever of any further increase in the armament of this country, and to that I shall address my remarks. As I understand the views as I have heard them expressed since I have been in Washington, gentlemen differ about this question for several reasons. Some hold to the position that no further preparation is necessary because this Government is already sufficiently prepared.

Others hold that no further preparation is necessary, because there will not be and can not be any war with any European country, advancing as an argument for that position that those countries will be exhausted when the present struggle is over, and hence they say any further preparation on the part of the Government would be a useless expenditure of public money and a useless burden placed on the shoulders of the taxpayers of the country. I am of the opinion that further preparation is absolutely necessary. I realize the fact that this is not a partisan question. I realize the fact that this is a question which presents itself to the patriotic heart of the Members of this body and to the patriotism of the citizenship of all this broad land. But I regret exceedingly to learn that while some of we Democrats are constantly saying that we do not doubt the intelligence and the patriotism of the present leader of our party, yet we, by our speeches and our insinuations and by reiterating the statement that the idea of "preparedness" is a propaganda of the great ammunition forces of the country and the great moneyed trusts and multimillionaires, thereby connect together in the minds of the American public the actions of the President with the actions of the forces seeking their own self-aggrandizement. The one is a denial of the other, a misrepresentation, unconsciously I know, of the position of the President, but one, to my mind, much to be regretted. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, my time is limited, and I must mention very briefly the considerations which lead me to the belief that further preparation is absolutely necessary on the part of the Government. I think there is a fundamental principle as a primary premise, and that is that every Government worthy of the name exists solely and alone for the purpose of protecting its citizens in their lives, their liberties, and in the possession and enjoyment of their property. No Government which does not do that can be worthy of the name, and any Government which refuses to do so in a proper case as against aggressions of foreign Governments simply abrogates all functions of government in that specific instance and denies any excuse for its existence. [Applause.] That, I believe, is a fundamental principle that will be agreed to by both sides of the House.

Understand, I do not mean that because some bandits totally unconnected with the Mexican government happened to kill several American citizens that that means that we should declare war upon Mexico. I am talking about aggressions by foreign Governments and not aggressions by individuals which were against the laws of their own country. But what I have stated, broadly speaking, as I understand it, is the fundamental principle of all government. That is the reason that government exists; that is the only excuse, as I understand it, for its existence. How can a Government do that, if that be true? There are several possible ways. One is to be prepared, if necessary, to use force in the vindication and the rights of its citizens and its institutions. Another is by persuasion through diplomatic negotiations, by the warfare of wits and reason rather than the warfare of armies and navies. Sometimes the one succeeds; sometimes the battle is won on the battle field of diplomacy, but sometimes that fails. If all men were reasonable, if all men were "moderns" in the sense that they had reached the point of the highest ethical culture, if all men were amenable to reason, if all men had "modern" consciences and a due regard for right and law, with power of moral perception to enable them to see the shadowy line that sometimes exists between what is right and true and what is wrong and false, all the battles and conflicts between individuals as well as nations could be settled by that method. But, unfortunately, while men of the present age all live in the modern time and are moderns in a sense, you can hardly find an audience composed of several hundred men where you do not find different stages of intellectual and

ethical culture, reaching from the stone age to the present. You have men to-day in American life, gigantic industrial forces they are, who have the ethical sense of a "Blue Beard" or a "Robin Hood." In almost any social assembly in Washington to-day of any size, if you could analyze the minds and ethical senses of those individuals, you would find cases of atavism, where, ethically considered, some gentlemen are living in the stone age instead of the present time, and they use the methods of the stone age in their business and in their government.

That is the actual situation, as I see it, in the world to-day. Now, you can not reason with a man unless he will reason with you. It is not possible to reason with a man and show him the right and expect anything unless at the same time that man is willing to do the right when once he sees it.

Now, what is true of individuals is true of nations. Nations do not always, unfortunately, decide their controversies on the basis of what is right and what is wrong. Most of the wars that are caused in the world are caused for financial and commercial aggrandizement, or possibly the glory of some reigning dynasty. And when a country comes in contact with forces like that, which essentially is unreasoning, that country can not accomplish its purpose and defend its rights in the name of diplomacy, because you can not reason with a man or a nation that is not willing to reason, and you can not settle disputes with a man or a nation which is not ethically willing to do what is right after the right has been decided. Hence, there come times in the history of all nations when an appeal to force or a threat to appeal to force is sometimes necessary; not always the actual appeal but the threatened appeal, the ability to appeal; for the reason that when you are dealing with a nation which does not care anything about the right, which does not care anything about reason, you must then defend your right by an appeal to some agency for which that nation has respect. [Applause.] So every nation—I lay it down as a fundamental proposition—must make some preparation to provide for those times in its history when an appeal to reason and an appeal to ethical standards are unavailing, and when the only thing that will avail is an appeal to force, either actually used or threatened. The founders of our Government and the various administrations that have followed one after another in its history have recognized this principle. Hence, we have an Army and we have a Navy. I think the use of the word "preparedness" or "unpreparedness" is an unfortunate use of terms. Every one is in favor of being prepared; no one is in favor of being unprepared. If unpreparedness be a virtue, then the more unprepared we are the better it will be, and the logical thing to do is to take our Navy out into the midst of the ocean and sink it and disband this Army we now have and be totally unprepared and entirely virtuous. [Applause.] But no one contends for anything of this character. As a matter of fact, we are in favor of being prepared. That is not where the difference lies. The difference lies in this: That some say we are prepared enough already. Others say we are not prepared but that we have no need for preparation; we will have no war, and hence preparation is unnecessary. Still others say our preparation is not sufficient.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it be a true and fundamental principle that this Government and other governments must make some preparation in the event of the contingencies arising when an appeal to reason and ethical standards will not avail, it follows logically that the preparation must be adequate in view of conditions. Now, are we sufficiently prepared? Do you know personally? No. Is there any Member of this House who knows personally? No. Is there any Member of this House who has spent as much as a week investigating the forces that this country has at its disposal? No.

Mr. DIES. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman overstates that. There are many who have spent many months studying practically this very question.

Mr. QUIN. And I desire to say that I have studied the subject constantly for three years, and spent many months on it.

Mr. VENABLE. If these are exceptions, I am very glad to hear them. [Applause.] I have spoken of the general body of this House, and my statement is but a statement of individual opinion, and if I have done the gentlemen an injustice, I most humbly apologize. Taking the body of this House as a whole, with men on other committees, engaging themselves day after day and hour after hour in the consideration of other governmental matters, as a matter of fact they do not know anything about the Army and about the Navy of this country.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENABLE. My time is very limited, sir; I would like to yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. VENABLE. They know but very little about the actual fighting and physical condition of this country. They do not know what industrial forces can be organized, and we must remember when wars come hereafter they will be wars of millions of men and millions of money. The European war has taught one lesson, and it has taught it thoroughly, that hereafter when nations go to war they are going to war by millions. No nation hereafter, a first-class power, will go to war except with the understanding that all of its resources, industrial, social, economic, and moral, shall be put behind the movement, because science has so endowed the art of killing that any nation which does not do that can not possibly survive.

Now, we Congressmen know nothing about it. I say we do not. I think it would take years of study—with all due respect to the magnificent talents of the gentleman who asked me to yield—to know much about the question, for I am not speaking of knowing a thing from magazine articles and the opinion of some other man, but I am talking about knowing the thing itself, not simply the opinion of this man and that man, but going to the original sources and knowing the actual thing as it actually is. No; the only means of knowing the present "preparedness" of this Nation are the men, the patriotic citizens, those gallant gentlemen who are soldiers and sailors by profession, who have devoted their lives to the service of this country, who daily and hourly declare in their uniforms and by the flash of their scabbards that if necessary they are willing to lay down their lives in defense of American property and American institutions. Upon their judgment we must perforce rely, and they say from their technical, accurate experience that we are not prepared to meet any first-class power of Europe.

Now, why be prepared? Is it wise to make this preparation? What is the purpose of it? I have heard arguments which said it would commit us to a policy of militarism; that soon we will be plunging into war; that the psychological effect of preparation would be such; that now, being peaceful and liberty-loving, we will then become warlike in spirit and, like Alexander, dream dreams of worlds on worlds to conquer. Sufficient preparation is the best guaranty of peace. [Applause.] That is the purpose of the fundamental idea of the President. He calls upon the country to make reasonable preparation, and he does not say that you have to adopt exactly his program. His cry is for reasonable preparation. It is for the President to suggest and Congress to enact, but he calls upon this country not as a partisan, not appealing to party, but to patriotism, calling upon Democrats and Republicans alike, as all Americans worshipping at a common altar of American institutions, to make some adequate preparation, not for the purposes of war but in order that we may have peace. [Applause.]

Now, is that true? Will it have that effect? Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure during my lifetime to be intimately and personally acquainted with two dogs. One of them was a little rat terrier who had a little tail curled over his back like a little corkscrew. That little dog's life was one long sad wall of misery. He was kicked by every man he met and whipped by every dog he ran across. I knew another dog, a magnificent gentleman of his race. His magnificent head reared itself above his shoulders as the head of a lion. He was stewed and sinewed like a gladiator, and his curved forelegs and staunch haunches spoke of tremendous strength. He lived his life respected by dogs and men. [Laughter and applause.] I owned him for five years, and I caressed him when I felt like kicking him. [Laughter.] Why? He was a prince of the house royal, a gladiator of his kind, and he was "prepared." [Applause.] As a result of that he lived his life in peace, unwhipped by any dog, and not having any dog to whip, admired of mankind, and caressed by all, and finally sank to sleep with all his institutions intact [laughter] and his personal and property rights thoroughly respected. [Laughter.]

The answer to the question of whether or not preparedness makes for peace is one of psychology. What is true of dogs is true of men. These gentlemen are from various parts of the Union, some from large cities and some from small villages. It used to be down in my country, in Mississippi, that sometimes there lived in a community two men who were known as "fighting characters," who took a pride in having whipped nearly everybody in the entire community, but the first case is to be recorded on the pages of American history where two fighters in the same community ever fought one another. They had a wholesome respect for one another's prowess. They knew what it meant, and as a result they were always for peace and for adjusting their differences on a reasonable basis.

Is it true among nations? China, poor old China, gets her coat tail kicked whenever anyone has the inclination. Maybe that is a slander on the Chinaman, because I recollect now he

does not wear a coat. [Laughter.] Whenever any country wants a port in China they take it. Has not that been the history of that country? But whoever took a German port or an English port? Why? Because those countries were prepared to defend the integrity of their territory, and as a result of it they have never been called upon to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about the cost and expense. While I think the classes that should pay this cost of "preparedness"—since they get the most protection, since they have the most at stake, since they would lose the most if war should come—are those who are of wealth, upon whom fortune has smiled, who can pay the tax without reducing their standard of living, without causing suffering in the restriction of their mode of life in anywise whatever. Yet even though we had to pay, all of us, a little money, taking us in the aggregate, we would not know we had paid it. It is much better to spend a few dollars than to spend much blood. [Applause.]

Now, as I understand it, the great argument against any increase in the Army or the Navy is that it will create a great military spirit, if that is what I understand gentlemen to mean by militarism. Mr. Speaker, that question was answered nineteen hundred years ago by the greatest Teacher that the world has ever seen. He enunciated a great principle of life when He said: "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

Mr. Speaker, it is not the martial music nor marching of tens of thousands of troops; it is not the roar of cannon; it is not the bugle call; it is not the military airs wafted on the breeze that creates a military spirit; it is the "thinking of men." I grant if we armed this country with thoughts of aggression; I grant you that if we played martial music while having in our minds and hearts the idea of taking territory and attaining military glory; I grant you that if as we drilled and heard the bugle call and martial airs we marched to the tune of this martial music dreaming dreams of conquest and of placing our heels upon the necks of subject peoples, we would cultivate in ourselves a military spirit, not because of the drilling but because of the thinking. "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he." But if, on the contrary, we listen to the martial music and the bugle call and we march in serried ranks upon the drill grounds of this Nation dreaming dreams, not of conquest, not of war, but thinking thoughts of home and fireside and peace and liberty, thinking thoughts of defense, thinking thoughts that we are doing this for the purpose of defending our homes and our firesides, thinking thoughts that we are doing this to prepare ourselves not for aggression but for defense, preparing ourselves not for conquest, but, if necessary, if need should come, to defend our homes, our firesides, our institutions, and our right to work out our own destiny in the history of the world, untrammelled by foreign powers, then instead of having inculcated in us a military spirit we will become more liberty loving. [Applause.] No man who has made up his mind that he is willing to die for liberty would ever be the man to take liberty from his fellows. [Applause.]

No man who has dedicated his life, his thoughts, and his desires to the defense of his own home and fireside will be the invader of the home and fireside of another. You have a large Navy now, comparatively speaking. Do you think the existence of that Navy has cultivated any military spirit in the American people? It has not; and yet, if we are logical, if a large Navy will cultivate it, then a smaller Navy would necessarily cultivate it—to a less extent, but still cultivate it. There have been a half million young men of this country who have been trained and drilled in the National Guard. I have been a member of it during my life. I have marched 12 or 15 or 20 miles a day sometimes, and had a pack on my back weighing 90 pounds. I have drilled; I have fought sham battles; I have gone into camp; I have listened to martial music. Half a million of us have done the same thing. Have you heard the National Guard declare that we should declare war upon somebody in order that the National Guard might have glory? No; and why? Because the central idea and purpose of the National Guard has been home defense; and while we drilled, and while we tried to equip ourselves, and while we listened to the roar of the cannon and the rattle of the machine guns there was burning in our minds the idea that we were training ourselves for the defense of home and fireside and country in order that we might have peace and the opportunity to work out our own destiny in the history of the world. [Applause.] And instead of cultivating in us a military spirit there has been cultivated in us a love of our country.

As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he.

Mr. Speaker, I come from an old-fashioned State. They still read Burns and Scott and the romances of the past. There is a degree of romanticism among my people. They are not

wealthy in this world's goods, comparatively speaking, but they are pure-blooded Americans. They have never espoused a cause in their lives that they have not been willing to lay down everything for, as they have demonstrated on a thousand battle fields. When they look upon the flag that floats from the dome of this Capitol, they see in that flag a statement of the fact that behind them, protecting them, over them, and sheltering them stands the great American Nation, and they love that flag now because it symbolizes to them their Government. They are not wealthy according to the standards of other States, but I want to say that I believe I voice the sentiment of that country and the people of my State when I say that I believe that if this Congress should decide, after deliberation and with all the facts before them, that this country needs further and other preparation, you will find the Mississippians standing squarely behind the Democratic administration. [Applause.] And one thing I do know, and that is that they believe that we have in the White House the greatest President we have had since the time of Thomas Jefferson [applause on the Democratic side], and I do know that the people down there, and I believe in the South generally, expect their Representatives here to hold up his hands. [Prolonged applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the temporary absence of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOBLAND], who has the next allotment of time, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS] for 20 minutes.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TAXATION.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, for 40 days I have attended the sessions of this House and have answered to every roll call and listened to the many able addresses that have been delivered upon the floor of the House, touching the merits and demerits of the questions which have been brought to the attention of the House.

At the opening session of this House our distinguished and esteemed Speaker, Mr. CLARK, whom we all, universally, respect and admire for his fairness and scholarly attainments, in accepting the high honor which the majority of this House conferred upon him, said to the House that he "hoped this Congress would be a working Congress and not a talking Congress." He evidently had in mind at the time the great responsibilities that were resting upon us in our individual and collective capacity. He certainly clearly understood the critical condition of the affairs of this Nation, and the enormity of the great problems and questions with which this Congress would have to deal in providing for our present and future necessities.

Probably no Congress in years has had to do or to deal with questions that were of such vital importance to this Government, to the people of this Nation, and to our institutions. That the affairs of this Nation are in a critical condition can not be successfully denied. The facts are supported and sustained by departmental and documentary evidence, and are conclusive.

Now, it is not my purpose to criticize, personally, any person connected with the present administration. I clearly understand that political parties are necessary to good government, and I further clearly understand the wide difference of opinion between the two great parties of to-day with reference to the methods and principles upon which the affairs of this Government must be managed and directed, and with this knowledge at hand I have only in view, at this time, to present to this House some facts and figures which, in my judgment, will in a measure tend at least to support my contention with reference to the methods proposed for raising revenue by the present administration.

An important part of President Wilson's message to Congress on December 7 last dealt with the present state of the Treasury, and of the fiscal problems which the next year will probably disclose. The President said:

Assuming that the taxes imposed by the emergency revenue act and the present duty on sugar are to be discontinued, the deficit in the general fund of the Treasury on the 30th day of June, 1917, will be nearly \$235,000,000. Adding \$50,000,000 for a safe working balance for the Treasury and \$12,000,000 to meet the usual deficiency estimates, the total deficit would rise to \$297,000,000.

How to raise sufficient revenue to meet the ordinary expense of the Government and the extraordinary expenses of the proposed plans of "preparedness" is the fiscal problem which presented itself to the President. The President's suggestions were that, "All of the present taxes or their equivalents" be continued. That is, that the present customs duty on sugar be re-

tained and the emergency revenue act be reenacted. In addition to this, retain all other revenue acts now in force. But, this plan, as the President pointed out, will still leave "a total deficit of some \$112,000,000."

He asked, "How shall we obtain this new revenue of \$112,000,000?" He opposed the issuing of bonds for the purpose, because, as he said, "Borrowing is shortsighted finance." Mr. Speaker, if "shortsighted finance" had not gotten in its deadly work when the Underwood-Simmons tariff law was passed the revenues of this Government would have been ample and the recent report of the Secretary of the Treasury would have shown a surplus instead of a deficit. [Applause.]

The President says that "We should pay as we go." We, the people, have been unable so far, during this administration, to "pay as we go," and now new forms of taxation are proposed, or, rather, suggested, in order to relieve us of the present financial embarrassment. With 61.6 per cent of all imports entering our ports absolutely free of duty; with the average ad valorem rate of duty on total imports only 12.8 per cent; and with \$41,000,000 less of revenue from customs duties than we had in 1910, the President calmly advises Congress that "The new bills should be paid by internal taxation." He suggested that we draw the greater part of the needed revenue from income taxes, by lowering the present limits of exemption and the figures at which the surtax should begin to be imposed, and by increasing the surtax itself.

He intimated that there are many additional sources of revenue that can be resorted to, apparently forgetting for the moment that if there are numerous sources of revenue in this country it is because industries have been fostered and built up by a protective tariff.

Forms of taxation recommended are: The tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline and naphtha, 50 cents per horsepower on automobiles and internal-explosion engines, a stamp tax on bank checks, 25 cents per ton on pig iron and on fabricated iron and steel.

I can not agree with the plan proposed by the President. I will vote against any measure that may be presented to this House or to this Congress that even tends to increase the present burden of direct taxation upon the American people. There are other ways and means by which this revenue, so essential at this time, may be raised that will not in any way tend to increase the burden of direct taxation. The American people to-day are groaning under the great burden of taxation, and, so far as I am concerned, I shall not cast a vote for a measure that will even tend to increase that burden.

Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, believed in reducing internal taxation and that as much of our revenue as possible should be raised from customs duties. In Jefferson's time 83 per cent of the revenues of the Government was raised by customs duties. To-day less than 39 per cent of the revenues are so raised.

To place a direct tax on automobiles per horsepower is unjust and unfair. The automobile has come to stay, and is a necessity. At the time of its incipency the automobile was more ornamental than useful, being frail and unreliable, but time has improved it until to-day it is one of the most rapid and economical means of transit and is being used by men in all stations in life. To the rich and poor alike it is advantageous and useful in numerous and various ways.

In nearly all, if not quite all, of the States of this Union a license tax is imposed upon owners of automobiles. The owner is required to pay an annual personal tax, according to its real value. He must, of course, pay for repairs and power—gasoline or electricity—and should the plans of the present administration, or the recommendations of the present administration be carried out, he will be required to pay in addition 50 cents per horsepower as an additional direct tax. In the congressional district that I have the honor to represent, there are about 6,000 registered automobiles, as shown by the records of the auditor of State, the average horsepower of which is at least 30. Now, a direct tax of 50 cents per horsepower would mean \$15 per year that each and every owner of an automobile in my congressional district must pay as a direct tax for the purpose of raising revenue with which to liquidate the current expenses incident to the running of this Government. In my district alone the automobile owners would be required to pay the sum of \$90,000 annually, to say nothing of the tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline. On the farms, where automobiles, tractors, and power machines of all kinds are found, this direct-tax proposal to tax automobiles and gasoline would be just about as welcome as a black frost in June.

In addition to the present war tax, if the tax program, as suggested and recommended in the message of the President, should be executed by Congress, it is estimated that in my

State—Ohio—the taxpayers would be required to pay annually \$9,834,921, and that tax would be distributed as follows: Bank checks, \$2,500,000; automobiles, \$2,772,790; pig iron, \$1,320,856; steel, \$2,352,668; and gasoline, \$888,607. This estimate was arrived at by taking the figures of the United States Bureau of Commerce for the iron and steel production in Ohio; the statistics of State Automobile Registrar Walker on the horsepower of automobiles; the figures of clearing-house associations on bank checks; and the report of State oil inspectors on gasoline inspection.

The bank clearings for the eight largest cities in the State of Ohio totaled \$3,263,391,813 in the year 1914. Bank officials say that this represents about one-third of the face value of checks issued each year, as many are cashed in the bank upon which they are drawn, while smaller Ohio cities, having no clearing-house associations, are not included in the above estimate. Taking \$10,000,000,000 as the total clearings, the number of checks was arrived at by dividing the sum by 40. Bankers in several cities, after watching the business for a day, agreed that the face value of checks average \$40. This makes 250,000,000 checks a year's output. Although the President does not stipulate the amount of the tax on bank checks, it is believed and this estimate is made upon the assumption that the tax will be 1 cent for each check.

The tax of 50 cents per horsepower on automobiles, motor cycles, and internal-explosion engines was not hard at which to arrive. Registrar Walker estimated that the average horsepower of 182,000 automobiles in Ohio is 30. Although some machines are 90 horsepower, one-third of the total number are of the make which has but 22-horsepower engines, while motor cycles average 4 horsepower.

The pig-iron production in Ohio was 5,283,426 tons in the year 1914, according to the Government statistics. At 25 cents per ton, the revenue would be \$1,320,856. The last annual figures on steel production gives the total as 4,705,337 tons, which includes steel made by all processes—Bessemer, open-hearth, basic, acid, and crucible. At 25 cents per ton, this would net a tax of \$2,353,668.

Ohio is hit particularly hard by the tax on steel and iron ore, as its location midway between the iron ore and coking-iron fields, its natural deposits of crude oil and natural gas, and the excellent transportation facilities afforded make Ohio one of the leading States in this industry.

The report of the State oil inspector shows 1,393,883 barrels, or 71,088,033 gallons, of gasoline and naphtha were inspected in 1914 before being sold. At 1 cent per gallon, the tax on this would be \$710,880; but the output of gasoline and naphtha in Ohio for the year 1915 is nearly 25 per cent larger than it was in the year 1914, and consequently the revenue would be, in fact, \$888,607.

This, of course, is an estimate, approximately correct, and these figures show just how the taxpayers of my State and of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent would be affected in dollars and cents. Think of this enormous additional burden being placed upon the taxpayers of this Nation for the sole purpose of raising revenue in order to carry out the program and plans of the present administration.

I desire here to quote from the speech made in the United States Senate by FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, of Nevada, on January 11, 1916, in which he said:

Mr. President, the Democratic Party, after nearly three years of power, is about to enter upon a presidential campaign, in which its acts of legislation and administration will be up for criticism or commendation. The Democratic Party is within a year of an election which will determine whether its lease of power shall continue or end. We have the time and the power before the next election to do every beneficial thing we ought to do and to undo every mistaken thing we ought not to have done. It is a time for mutual candor and counsel and for efficiency of methods in devising and carrying out a definite legislative program.

And after reviewing what this administration has done in the way of legislation, and after clearly admitting the inefficiency of the Underwood-Simmons tariff law with reference to the production of revenue, and that the apparent prosperity of this country was wholly and entirely due to the great war now raging in the Eastern Hemisphere, and after admitting that were it not for the revenue secured to this country by reason of the exports of war materials, munitions, and provisions to the belligerent countries this country would be suffering from general business depression, and after admitting that "if that war soon comes to a close and the manufacture of munitions ends, and, added to this source of unemployment, our markets, now protected by the war from invasion, are overwhelmed with the cheap products of the nations just emerging from the war and eager to get back their gold, we may have not only an aggravated industrial depression to meet, but a financial condition fruitful of paralyzing caution." And, after suggesting the many

things at are to be done by this Congress in carrying out the administration program, he says:

But where is the money to come from? My answer is additional taxation. This country is not bankrupt. It will readily respond to intelligent taxation which will be spent in a general way for the welfare of the country, and particularly if a large part of the additional taxation is for public works, which will secure employment during a period of depression. Regarding taxation, I am glad to observe that the administration favors the continuance of the existing sugar tax. The duty on sugar has always been a revenue duty. There has never been a period in the history of this Republic that a sugar duty has not existed, except during McKinley's administration, when a bounty was substituted for a tax. This will prevent our revenues from being depleted to the extent of \$30,000,000 more, as is threatened by existing legislation.

I most heartily commend Senator NEWLANDS for his frank admission made in that speech. These admissions, coming from a Democratic Senator of most excellent character, whose integrity is above reproach and whose every word is as pure as gold, is certainly conclusive proof that the present administration's program has been a most complete failure.

In this same speech the Senator, in the second paragraph from the bottom of page 11, again suggests that—

The second method of increasing our revenues is to extend the area of our income tax. All incomes of single men below \$3,000 and of married men below \$4,000 are now exempt. The limit should be reduced to \$2,000 or \$1,500, and from this source fifty or sixty million dollars more revenue annually can be derived.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is true that all incomes over and above \$3,000 and \$4,000, respectively, are now taxable under the income-tax law. This is another method of direct taxation legislated by the present administration. To this law I am also opposed. The exemption is entirely too low. It is the man with the ordinary income, the comparatively poor man, who suffers by reason of this law. The rich man, who is able to cover up or hide away his money, escapes the operation of this law, and the burden falls upon the man who is able to earn only an ordinary salary. Every Member of this House has had a taste of the income tax. You know what it means to have your congressional incomes tolled. Please keep in mind that this is another method of direct taxation about which I am talking.

The annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, shows that—

The total receipts from personal income tax were \$41,046,162.09, an increase of \$12,792,627.24 over the preceding year. The total receipts from corporation income tax for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, were \$39,144,531.71, a decrease of \$3,983,208.18. The increase in the personal income-tax receipts was due, in a great measure, to the fact that the collections for the fiscal year 1915 were for a period of 12 months, whereas the collections for the fiscal year 1914 was for 10 months, and also to the further fact that the administration of the law is now working more smoothly.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in commenting upon this law, on page 17 of his report, says:

Many inaccurate returns are made, some deliberately and some ignorantly, and there are, without doubt, wholesale evasions of the law throughout the country.

This statement bears out my contention that the burden of the income tax is more largely borne by the man of ordinary wealth and limited means than by the rich.

In this same report, at pages 20 and 21, the Secretary says:

With the restoration of peace in Europe the customs duties collected under existing laws will gradually increase as imports from the countries now at war are gradually restored to a normal basis. How long this process will take, no one can say, nor can anyone predict when the European war will end. Our obvious duty in the meantime is to provide the revenue of the Government from sources affected as little as possible by foreign war or external disturbances. This we can readily do, as stated in another part of this report, without imposing heavy burdens upon the people of the country.

It will be observed that the Secretary of the Treasury does not suggest where in this report the remedy that he suggests can be found, but by an examination of the report you will find his recommendation on page 51, and I quote him from this page:

It is evident that the emergency revenue measure and the existing duty on raw sugar can be continued with advantage.

This being done, we now have to consider the new forms of taxation which must be resorted to for the purpose of providing the additional revenues required, the major part of which is needed to carry out the large program for national defense.

I shall have something to say on the question of "national defense" possibly later on in this session, but I do not care to mix my subjects here. I am now endeavoring to discuss internal taxation, or direct taxation, and the effect thereof upon the taxpayers of this Nation.

And, again, the Secretary says:

The total amount so required for the year 1917 is \$112,806,394.22, including \$25,000,000 of expenditures for the Panama Canal in each of the years 1916 and 1917.

And, again quoting from this report, the Secretary says:

With the return of peace in Europe the revenues from customs will undoubtedly increase again, and in time a large part of the customs revenues lost in the fiscal year 1915 will be restored.

But what about the customs revenues lost in the year ending August 1, 1914, when the Underwood-Simmons tariff law had been in full force and effect for about a year, and before the war had broken out? In that year the loss of revenues amounted to more than \$260,000,000, and this was before the war had been declared or had begun in Europe, or before the effect of the war could have been felt in this country.

Further quoting the Secretary, he says:

The entire amount of the deficiency, estimated on the basis hereinbefore stated, for the fiscal year 1917, amounting to \$112,806,394.22 (which includes payment of Panama Canal expenditures for 1916 and 1917 from the general fund, and provides for the maintenance of a general fund working balance in the Treasury of \$50,000,000) can easily be raised by internal taxation without appreciable burdens upon the American people.

[Applause.]

This rank and reckless statement of the Secretary of the Treasury and conclusion of his will not be accepted by the American taxpayers as even tending toward the truth. The present methods of internal taxation are most obnoxious and distasteful to the American taxpayer without adding thereto additional tax burdens.

We have only to take the report of the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain that during the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1915, individuals paid income taxes to the amount of \$41,046,162.09. It was no small sum to be paid by the individual taxpayers for the purpose of creating revenue. Under the emergency revenue act, or war tax in time of peace, in this same report, it is shown that the people paid the sum of \$52,069,126.29. This is another example of raising revenue by the present administration—through direct or internal taxation. The corporations of the country paid an income tax of \$39,155,596.77.

Under the present plan of the administration, it is proposed or suggested to place a tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline and naphtha, which will amount, approximately, to \$10,000,000 per year; a tax of 50 cents per horsepower on automobiles and internal-explosion engines, which will amount, approximately, to \$15,000,000; a stamp tax on bank checks, which will amount to approximately \$18,000,000 per year; a tax of 25 cents per ton on pig iron, which will amount to approximately \$10,000,000 per year; and a tax of 25 cents per ton on fabricated iron and steel, which will amount to approximately \$10,000,000 per year.

The emergency or war tax in time of peace is to be continued for another year, or until January, 1917, which will mean the payment of approximately \$52,069,126.29; and the individual income tax will, of course, be continued, which will, approximately, reach the sum of \$50,000,000; and all of these sums, amounting to \$245,270,885.15, are to be raised by internal or direct taxation upon the American taxpayers.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICKETTS. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he has made an estimate as to the amount of the tax now raised by the direct method instead of the indirect method in per cent? What per cent of the revenues of the country are direct and what per cent are indirect?

Mr. RICKETTS. I have, and I will come to that directly.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICKETTS. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Does not the gentleman think that if we were to have a protective-tariff policy all of these revenues could be raised under the present condition of our imports by a protective tariff and not by direct taxation?

Mr. RICKETTS. I most certainly do; and I think I shall be able to prove that fact by the figures that I have collated. And I want to say to Members of this House that I have taken some time and some interest in searching the reports as to commerce and the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, and have gone over to the Library of Congress and considered all these matters seriously, and the result is no guess of mine as to the figures that I am presenting to this House. I think it is important that the House should know all about it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RICKETTS. Certainly.

Mr. BORLAND. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman's colleague from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] the gentleman's answer was that all these taxes could be raised by a protective tariff, rather than by an income tax. But in that case the poorer people would pay the bulk of the tax, would they not, whereas in the case of the income tax it is the substantial people who pay?

Mr. RICKETTS. Oh, I know it is the claim of the gentleman's side of the House that the man who buys the foreign goods pays the tariff. I understand that clearly. In other words, that the Republican Party taxes the people without their knowledge and the Democratic Party taxes the people without their consent. [Applause and laughter.]

I want to say further, in answer to the gentleman's question, that if his party is right in its theory that the consumer pays the tax, I want him to answer this question: He knows and I know that the Democratic Party condemned the Payne-Aldrich tariff law in one of the planks of its platform adopted at Baltimore in the convention of 1912. They said in that platform that the high cost of living was due to the iniquitous Payne-Aldrich tariff law; that the high cost of living of the people must be reduced; and that if the Democratic Party was successful it would give them a tariff law that would relieve them of that burden and that you would reduce the high cost of living. Now, you gave them the Underwood-Simmons tariff law, and, of course, the American consumer is not to-day paying the duty that he was paying. Then I want to know why it is that the high cost of living to the laboring class of people and the people generally in the United States has not been reduced one single cent, but, on the contrary, has advanced. [Applause on the Republican side.] In the fall of 1914 I said to the people of my congressional district—to 5,000 people in the city of Lancaster, Ohio, a large percentage of whom were Democrats—that if any man present could name one single article used for domestic purposes that he could purchase more cheaply under the Underwood-Simmons tariff law than he could under the Payne-Aldrich law I would willingly leave the platform and yield to him for his statement. Not a single, solitary man was able to name one article that could be so purchased. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. RICKETTS. Oh, certainly.

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman has stated that under the protective tariff you would derive a sufficient sum of money to meet all of the expenditures that are now proposed.

Mr. RICKETTS. No, sir.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I understood you to say that.

Mr. RICKETTS. I take it for granted that you are including preparedness, and the extravagant appropriations that are to be made during this Congress?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Well, aside from preparedness.

Mr. RICKETTS. Aside from preparedness and the extravagant appropriations that in all probability will be made by the majority side of this House in this session, I say that a protective-tariff revenue would be sufficient. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Why, then, was it that when your party was in power in time of peace and prosperity they found it necessary to issue bonds, even to dig the Panama Canal? [Cries of "Oh!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. RICKETTS. That was certainly an emergency.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICKETTS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Is it not true that we paid \$232,000,000 out of current revenues, for which it was unnecessary to issue bonds?

Mr. RICKETTS. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Out of the \$375,000,000 bond issue that was authorized there was only \$132,000,000 issued, because we paid the other out of current revenues.

Mr. RAGSDALE. But you authorized the other, and did sell a part of them instead of taking it all out of the fund derived from your protective tariff.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, that statement is not correct. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will permit this interruption.

Mr. RICKETTS. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. There was an authorization of \$375,000,000, the proceeds to be used for the construction of the Panama Canal. Of those bonds there were sold \$134,000,000, and they were sold at a premium of some \$4,000,000, so that a total of \$138,000,000 was realized. The sum of \$191,000,000 over and above the proceeds of those bonds was paid out of the general fund, and there never was a year when any bonds were sold, but that there was a larger amount of money paid out of the general fund for that purpose than was received from the sale of the bonds. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me, then—

Mr. RICKETTS. I must decline to yield further as my time is limited. I do not want to be discourteous.

In the years 1914 and 1915, ending June 30, 1915, the amount of taxes paid by the individual taxpayers under the income law was the sum of \$76,064,259.75, and yet the Secretary would

have you believe that this amount of internal taxation was paid by the American taxpayer for revenue purposes without any appreciable burden. It is high time that the American taxpayer wake up and study carefully and consistently the question of raising revenues with which to defray the expenses of this Government. If he stands idly by and gives this matter no personal attention, it will not be long until the burdens of internal taxation will be absolutely unbearable and beyond his ability to meet.

Every taxpayer owes it to himself, to his neighbor, and to his fellowman to analyze for himself and ascertain just who it is that is now paying the revenue in this great country of which we are so proud and of which the American loves to boast.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. How much more time does the gentleman want?

Mr. RICKETTS. I should like to have 15 or 20 minutes more.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Ohio be extended 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, although the gentleman would not yield to me even for a question, I will not object.

Mr. RICKETTS. I thank the gentleman. The total revenue collected for the year ending June 30, 1915, exclusive of postal revenue, was \$720,399,782.58; of this amount \$209,786,672.21 was collected from customs duties and \$415,559,646 was collected as internal revenue or as a direct tax.

Now, the total amount expended by this administration for this particular period of time was \$777,840,292.33, this being an expenditure of \$57,442,509.77 more than the receipts.

Now, what is the trouble? A careful analysis of the foregoing figures will disclose that the present administration last year spent \$57,000,000 more than it actually had on hand to disburse, and the major portion, or 61 per cent, of the amount expended was raised by internal revenue or by a direct tax upon the people. I am unequivocally against this policy. It is not good business, and it is my conviction that the business of this Government should be conducted upon a strictly business basis. Will anyone in good faith contend that the methods thus used and proposed are businesslike in their character? Would you conduct your private business in this manner?

Now, what are the methods that have been used and that are proposed? The appropriations for the last three years have been constantly increased each and every year, as shown by the following table:

Appropriations for the years 1913-1915.

1913	\$988,353,340
1914	1,057,605,694
1915	1,089,408,777

During all of these years the Democratic Party has had control of Congress, and has been in the majority in Congress.

It is proposed this year to appropriate the enormous sum of \$1,127,284,191.63. This is certainly an unnecessary and lavish appropriation of the people's money, and, as a representative of the people of my congressional district, I can not allow myself to stand here silent and make no protest against it.

During a 10-month period under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law the balance of trade in our favor amounted to more than \$606,000,000. During the corresponding 10 months under the Underwood-Simons tariff law, and before the war, the balance in our favor was \$345,000,000 only. A loss of \$260,000,000, or \$26,000,000 per month. That was a loss of \$1,000,000 per day for every working day in each month, covering a period of 10 months, and this period was before the outbreak of the war in Europe.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RICKETTS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Was there not a period during the first seven months when the balance of trade was against us instead of in favor of us?

Mr. RICKETTS. As to the month, I have not investigated. I can not answer that now.

Mr. FESS. For the month of April, 1914, the balance of trade was against us.

Mr. RICKETTS. I accept the gentleman's statement as to that.

This deficit was made up in a large measure by the income-tax law, which was passed in March, 1913, the provisions of which imposed an income tax, or a direct tax, upon the people of this Nation who should earn, if married, more than \$4,000, or, if unmarried, more than \$3,000 annually.

That distinguished and highly esteemed Democrat, Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee,

said in his defense of the Democratic tariff law, recently published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It will be conceded by all fair-minded men, the Republicans and Democrats alike, that the just and proper way to judge and assess the value and virtue of the Underwood Act is to consider the effect of its operation from its passage on October 3, 1913, to August 1, 1914, the time of the outbreak of the European war.

I have just shown by the figures above that, during the time referred to by the gentleman of the Ways and Means Committee the balance of trade against us was \$263,000,000, or \$26,000,000 per month, or an average of \$1,000,000 a day for every working day, and I am herewith submitting a table that shows exactly what the exports and imports were during this time in each of the corresponding years:

Merchandise.	10 months ended July 31—	
	1913 (Republican peace period).	1914 (Democratic peace period).
Imports into United States:		
Free of duty.....	\$821,608,167	\$988,187,549
Dutiable.....	682,218,836	617,617,233
Total imports.....	1,503,827,003	1,605,804,782
Exports from United States:		
Domestic.....	2,078,500,810	1,921,538,131
Foreign.....	31,965,829	30,040,165
Total exports.....	2,110,466,639	1,951,578,296
Excess of exports.....	606,639,636	345,773,514

A careful examination of these figures will disclose clearly that the Underwood-Simmons tariff law had proved a failure so far as producing revenue is concerned, prior to the outbreak of the war in Europe, and in order to meet this deficit we have the substitutes that they call the "emergency-tax" law and the "income-tax" law, both of which are a direct tax upon the people of this Nation; and I do not care what the politics of any constituent of mine may be, it is only fair for me to present to him the exact situation as it exists here at this time. I said before, and I reiterate now, that the principle of direct taxation or internal taxation is absolutely wrong.

It is now proposed to reduce the exemption, under the income-tax law, to both married and single men, making the exemption of the married man \$2,000 and the exemption of the single man \$1,500. This will catch the mechanic, the engineer, the professional man, the physician, the dentist, the minister of the Gospel, the professor, the lecturer, the merchant, and the railroad employee, and quite a large number of men laboring in coal and oil fields, all of whom are comparatively poor men, and who are by this method charged with double taxation on what they are able to earn, and it tends to impoverish them and to take from them that which they have earned by honest toil and persistent effort, and of which, in many instances, they are deeply in need. Besides, it tends to discourage those who are inclined to save their money by frugal living and constant effort and invest it in property. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The President suggests that we pay as we go, and under the present program we are asked to contract an indebtedness that we shall not be able to pay for a period of at least five years, and it should be kept constantly in mind that if we should do this about 61 per cent of this indebtedness will have to be paid by internal taxation, or a direct tax, upon the American people. I am, therefore, opposed to the principles of direct taxation, and shall vote against the same whenever and wherever I have an opportunity so to do.

The great question with the present administration seems to be, How can we raise the money? The question as to reducing expenses and saving money does not seem to be of much importance to it.

This attitude impels me to refer to the "economy" plank of the Democratic Party platform adopted at Baltimore in 1912, which reads as follows:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

What offices have been eliminated?

No reverence or respect has been paid to this plank in the Baltimore platform since March 4, 1913, the beginning of this administration.

The total appropriations of the first Democratic Congress were, in round numbers, about \$2,200,000,000, or \$113,000,000 larger than its predecessor, and about \$197,000,000 larger than the last Republican Congress, whose "profligate waste of money through lavish appropriations" was so soundly denounced by the national Democratic platform.

The appropriations for 1914 would have been \$43,000,000 higher than they were had the Republican minority in the Senate not fought the iniquitous river and harbor bill, which carried large sums for the "improvement" of small creeks and unnavigable rivers in the South, and compelled its reduction by \$43,000,000 before permitting it to become a law.

In 1915 the appropriations would have been \$11,593,000 more than for 1914 had the Post Office and Indian bills not failed to pass.

Does this appeal to you as economical on the part of this administration? No, no; it is not economy. It is "profligate waste," a reckless disbursement of the finances of the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Further comment is unnecessary, but I do want to call the attention of this House to a speech delivered by one of the most able and conscientious workers in Congress, Mr. FITZGERALD, of Brooklyn, N. Y., who, in a speech delivered in Congress, said:

We charged the Republicans for 12 years of my service in the House under Republican administration with being grossly extravagant and reckless in the expenditure of the public money. I believed that charge to be true. I believed that my party when placed in power would demonstrate that the charges we had made in good faith were true. We are entitled to the help and support of the Members on this side of the House in honest efforts to carry out the pledges of the Democratic Party and in our attempts to show that what we charged in order to get into power were true. We have not had that support. Our Democratic colleagues have not given that support to us thus far during this session of Congress. They have unnecessarily piled up public expenditures until the Democratic Party is becoming the laughingstock of the country.

No more able and conscientious Congressman ever graced a seat on the Democratic side of this House. He was objecting to the extravagant appropriations that were about to be made, fully appreciating that the extravagance proposed by his party would eventually subject it to severe criticism by the American people, and would ultimately result in its complete overthrow; and I concede that he was correct in his conclusions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Let me suggest here and now to the Members of this House that too much time is spent on the floor of this Chamber in extracting oxygen from the air and not enough time spent by us in studying economy and the ways and means by which the practice of raising revenue by internal or direct taxation on the American people may be eliminated. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The proper method of raising revenue is the tariff duty upon a protective basis. It will not be done by the Underwood law. That law is a dismal disappointment, even to its proponents. Its failure is conceded by the President in his request to suspend its operation upon the item of sugar. I shall vote to suspend its operation on sugar. I am heartily in accord with this notion of the President as to the method of raising revenue, and I ask him to suspend its operation on wool, and thereby raise \$21,970,499.81; upon lumber, and thereby raise a revenue of \$1,962,560.16; and upon agricultural products, fruits, and so forth. In this way abundant revenue will be raised and, as I said before, no one will feel the burden, and especially will the taxpayer be relieved and American industries and American labor will be stimulated and encouraged.

The revenue under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law for the year ending June 30, 1913, on cattle, lumber, eggs, fruit, sheep, horses, hay, sugar, and wool is shown by the following table, to wit:

Cattle.....	\$1,764,650.58
Lumber.....	1,962,560.16
Eggs.....	63,588.28
Fruit.....	5,364,220.19
Sheep.....	13,909.50
Horses.....	79,330.25
Hay.....	621,526.98
Wool.....	21,970,499.81
Sugar.....	53,134,243.63

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Ohio may be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICKETTS. Under the Underwood-Simmons tariff law these articles are imported into the United States practically

free of duty, and the Government loses in revenue the sum of \$84,974,538.38 annually.

The claim is made that because of the loss of customs duties on imports, due to a great falling off of imports during the European war, is the sole reason of continuing the emergency war tax measure and for the proposed increased taxation of the American people. This claim is absurd, as the following facts will substantiate:

For the 10 months of the fiscal year 1915, ending the last of April, our total imports were \$6,000,000 less than they were for the same months of 1912, when a protective tariff was in force. The reports of the Department of Commerce for this period of time show tariff imports amount to \$1,516,000,000. For the same months in 1912, under the Payne-Aldrich law, the imports were \$1,522,000,000. So the record for 10 months shows that total imports, in spite of the war, were almost as large as they were during the corresponding months of the last fiscal year of the Payne-Aldrich law.

These important figures give an excellent opportunity to compare some of the features of the Underwood-Simmons law with those of the Payne-Aldrich law.

In 1912, for the period mentioned, 53.5 per cent of the total imports were free of duty; in 1915, 61.6 per cent of all imports were free of duty, and only 38.4 per cent of our imports paid any duty at all. The average ad valorem rate of duty in 1912 was a little over 18 per cent. In 1915 it was only 12.8 per cent.

In 1912, \$1,522,000,000 worth of imports paid into the United States Treasury in customs duties \$285,000,000; in 1915, \$1,516,000,000 worth of imports paid into the Treasury only \$191,000,000 in duties. With the Payne-Aldrich rate of duty in force in 1915, instead of the Underwood-Simmons rate, the Government would have received nearly \$100,000,000 more in revenue from customs duties, a deficit would have been avoided, and the so-called "war tax" would have been unnecessary, and we would not have had to resort to an "income tax."

If it had not been for the European war, industrial distress in the United States would have assumed alarming proportions. The war did not shut off all imports, but it greatly curtailed them. It has been stated in the report of the Secretary of Commerce that imports for 11 months of the fiscal year 1915 were \$1,516,000,000. For the same months in 1914, before the outbreak of the war, imports were \$1,736,000,000.

If the war had not intervened, the distress which marked the year 1914 as one of the most trying years in the industrial history of the country would have resulted in a Nation-wide calamity in the year 1915.

When in the course of time the war shall end we will find, if the Underwood-Simmons law remains in force, that we are as unprepared for the pursuits of peace as our present military organization leaves us unprepared for the stern business of war. The door of the past is locked and bolted. We can not undo the mischief that has been done, but we can do our part to prevent the repetition of such mischief in the future.

In conclusion let me say that I again here and now reiterate that the principle of direct taxation of the American people for the purpose of raising revenue with which to meet the financial demands of this Government is absolutely wrong, and I am unalterably and forever opposed to this method of raising revenue.

Why not revise the Underwood-Simmons tariff law so that it will meet the conditions that prevail and produce the revenue needed, and why not repeal the income-tax and the emergency-tax laws and relieve the American people from the bondage of direct taxation?

CHILD LABOR.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with the consent of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], that I may proceed for two minutes to correct a statement in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETS], I want to say that in an extension of his remarks in the RECORD, which appears on page 1845, I call attention that about the middle of the second column the gentleman says:

It has been said on the floor of this House by a gentleman from Georgia, who has the honor of representing a district in his State, that children 11 years old, both white and black, are being worked 13 hours per day in the cotton and knitting factories of North Carolina; that in some instances white children going to work pass colored children going to school; that the conditions surrounding the children who are thus required to toil day after day are anything but favorable. And in this State of North Carolina there is no such a thing as factory inspection.

The gentleman did not name the gentleman from Georgia to whom he attributes these remarks, and while I do not wish to be understood as making any apology to anybody from any section of the country for what I really did say, which the gentleman will find in the RECORD, on page 1761, I do want to say that if the gentleman referred to me, and I presume he did, because I was the only one from Georgia in favor of this bill who took the opposite side, that he must have got his information from some one other than myself. I made no such statement. As a matter of fact, I am sure the gentleman would not find the conditions in North Carolina that he portrayed in his speech, because I think the cotton mills there have found the labor of the negro children very unprofitable. I say this in justice to the State of North Carolina, and under their law now in existence they could not work a child under 12 years old. Their hours are 11 hours and not 13. I made no such statement as the gentleman attributed to me. He was in error. Such a statement might have been made by others on the floor of the House.

MARKETING OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with the consent of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], that I may address the House for two minutes on the subject of the marketing of farm products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at the meeting of the Southern Commercial Congress in the city of Muskogee, Okla., in my district, held from April 26 to 30, 1915, among other addresses delivered on that occasion was a speech by Hon. WILLIAM S. GOODWIN, of the seventh congressional district of Arkansas, upon the subject of Marketing or the Distribution of Farm Products.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, no question is of more immediate and pressing importance than the solution of a proper distribution of farm products. Much has been done to teach the American people how to produce, but Congress thus far has done but little to find a market for that which is grown upon the farm, and, as we know, many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of products go to waste annually for a lack of marketing facilities.

For the past year Mr. GOODWIN has been actively engaged in an effort to solve this problem, and a bill introduced by him at the last session of Congress has received general indorsement by the great agricultural people and their organizations throughout the country.

On account of Mr. GOODWIN's active interest in an effort to solve this vexing question he was chosen by the managers of the Southern Commercial Congress, that great organization that is doing so much to develop the South agriculturally and commercially, to deliver the address referred to and which I ask may be published herewith in an extension of my remarks upon this occasion. The address of Mr. GOODWIN follows:

MARKETING FARM PRODUCTS.

[An address by Hon. WILLIAM S. GOODWIN, Member of Congress from Arkansas, at the Sixth Annual Convention of the Southern Commercial Congress, Muskogee, Okla., Apr. 26 to 30, 1915.]

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, the pleasure to me is very great to be privileged to address this splendid gathering of the builders of the new South, whose purpose is so finely expressed in the motto of your great organization, "A Greater Nation through a Greater South." Since it was organized in 1908 the Southern Commercial Congress has speedily moved forward, with splendid achievement following splendid achievement to the accomplishment of this high resolve.

From the northernmost New England State of Maine to the North Pacific Commonwealth of Washington the people of the North as well as we of the South have been richly benefited by your activities, thus making the Nation your debtor for having already produced a greater financial freedom, a sounder commercial and a better agricultural development, and creating, finally, a broader and more sympathetic national understanding.

You have succeeded as an organization because all your work for a greater South is based on a recognition of the fact that the solid, enduring foundation on which a greater commercial South must be built is a greater agricultural South. And so the prosperity of the farmer thus far has been and, I venture to assert, always will be a matter of prime concern with you and occupy a leading place in your councils.

It is because of this interest in and devotion to a greater and more prosperous agriculture that I was invited to briefly outline to you the purpose and scope of the National Marketing Committee and the stupendous work for the advancement of agriculture it has undertaken.

The acknowledged obstacle in the way of the development of a better agriculture and the building up all through the South, as, indeed, elsewhere, of prosperous farming communities is the enormous wastes in handling and distributing farm products. These wastes are due to many causes, all of which by the adoption of more scientific methods in gathering, grading, standardizing, warehousing, together with a national cooperative system in quest of markets, can be eliminated or greatly reduced. These wastes, taking the Nation as a whole, run into billions of dollars annually; and the saving of even a small part of this enormous amount means not only a tremendous increase in the prosperity of the producers but, necessarily, a corresponding gain in commerce and manufacturing.

The farmers of this country produce annually a crop for which they receive \$9,000,000,000, and for which, it is said, the ultimate consumer pays \$27,000,000,000; or, to express it in this wise, the American farmer to-day is doing business on a 35-cent dollar and the consumer of his products pays 100 cents for the same amount of agricultural products for which the producer receives but 35 cents. Owing to the lack of some central directing intelligence there is an enormous amount of waste, especially in perishable products. At times 100 cars of fruit or vegetables are sent to a market which can consume but 10, and 10 are sent to a market that can use 100. Foodstuffs are shipped for long distances, only to be reshipped and consumed in the vicinity in which they were grown. Our storage and transportation facilities are first swamped, then starved; markets are unsteady and demoralized; produce is allowed to waste and rot in the fields and consumers are compelled to pay exorbitant prices.

There have been times when corn has been burned for fuel here in Oklahoma, when your coal mines were closed for want of orders of miners, while oil from your wells flowed like water in your branches and hungry workmen in idleness, begging for bread, were walking the streets of near-by cities, and the railroads were threatened with bankruptcy for want of traffic, and all simultaneously. Surely this is an unhealthy and unwarranted condition. Any system of distribution which permits one peck of potatoes to rot while one hungry man goes unfed is an obsolete and inadequate system. You farmers, who fail to receive an adequate price for your crops; you consumers, who pay your hard-earned dollar for products for which the farmer receives but 35 cents; and you employers of labor—none, none need to be told there is something wrong with our present methods when the high cost of living alone reduces the workmen's wage and overtime devours his income.

Under the present manner of marketing the producer receives too little, hence he seeks to lessen his losses by producing less; the consumer pays too much, and tries to cut down his expenses by consuming less; the railroads, having less to transport, charge more to make up for the loss of tonnage; the dealer charges a larger profit to make up for the smaller sale; and here we go round and round in a vicious circle, getting nowhere, the circle growing more vicious all the while.

Permit me to say just here, Mr. President, that neither the railroads nor the commission men nor the wholesalers nor the retailers should be charged with all the blame. Both the producer and consumer are entitled to their share of it. The producer needs to be taught the best manner, place, and time to market his crop; how to classify, arrange, grade, and pack it to meet the requirements of the trade; and the consumer needs to be taught better purchasing methods and to distinguish between high prices and expensive service.

If we as a Nation were pioneers in the work of attempting to scientifically systematize the handling and marketing of farm products, the practicability of our plans might be questioned; but, far from being pioneers, investigation shows that we are a quarter of a century behind the methods employed in Europe. In Germany, in particular, the system of handling and distributing farm products is carried to such perfection that investigators are unanimous in testifying that the foundation on which the commercial and military greatness of the German Empire is built is her wonderful system of handling and distributing farm products for the benefit and protection of her producers.

The supreme importance of improving the methods of marketing farm products has long been recognized, but efforts in that direction have been isolated and without definiteness of plan considering the subject as a whole. To Mr. David Lubin, that great man whose life is dedicated to the cause of agricultural betterment, the United States delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, Italy, is due the idea that we should study the German system with the view of adapting it to American conditions and of organizing to secure its adoption in this country. When he was in America last year many conferences were held with him in Washington and the question thoroughly considered. Finally, before Mr. Lubin left Washington last fall, a special meeting of certain Senators and Representatives in Congress, representatives of farm organizations, and members of the farm press was held, and the national marketing committee was organized. Your president, Senator FLETCHER, who is never so happy as when doing good and great things, was elected president of the committee. Its first vice president is William T. Creasy, for many years the head of the great grange organization of Pennsylvania and at present secretary of the National Dairy Union. The second vice president is that well-known westerner of large commercial and agricultural enterprises and magnificent public service, Congressman WILLIAM KENT, of California. Our secretary and managing director is that tireless, able, and loyal representative of organized farmers, George P. Hampton, of New York, a man of the highest standing as a student of the problems of distribution. On its executive board, of which I have the honor to be a member, is a man for whose executive and constructive ability all of us have the highest admiration, your own able managing director, Dr. Clarence J. Owens. Associated with us on this board are P. D. NORRIS, of North Dakota, and J. A. FALCONER, of Washington, both Members of the Sixty-third Congress, whose consistent activity in furthering agricultural interests especially is reflected by their record; also former United States Senator Obadiah Gardner, of Maine, the great grange builder of that State, and now chairman of the International Joint Commission; C. B. KEGLEY, the master of the Washington State Grange and president of the Rural Credit League of America; H. S. MOBLEY, the president of the Farmers' Union of Arkansas, and others of the ablest executives of the leading farm organizations.

The purpose of the national marketing committee is set forth in its prospectus, from which I quote:

1. To create an enlightened public opinion concerning the waste and unnecessary expense in handling and distributing farm products; and to assist in bringing before the country the information secured by the Federal Office of Markets and other National and State agencies.
2. To promote and foster proper marketing organizations and methods, to encourage and secure the standardization of agricultural products, to secure proper warehouse systems, to promote expert marketing services in the several States, to secure uniformity in methods by States in inaugurating investigational and demonstrational work in marketing, and to secure changes in Federal and State laws to these ends.
3. To secure, either through appointment by the President or by act of Congress, the establishment of a national marketing commission.

In the development of this program, resolutions were prepared and introduced in the United States Senate by Senator FLETCHER and in the House of Representatives by myself. These resolutions provide for the establishment of a national marketing commission by act of Congress.

The proposed legislation has received the indorsement of the legislative committee of the National Farmers' Union, representatives of various granges and farm organizations, the Farmers' Union of Arkansas and California, a half million people in California aside from the Farmers' Union of that State, and by many of the great farm journals

throughout the country, as well as boards of trade and commercial organizations. Throughout the Pacific Coast States, where cooperative marketing is better developed than in other sections, the plan has received the most enthusiastic indorsement by agricultural and consumers' organizations generally.

This spring, promptly upon the adjournment of Congress, the committee took hold of the plan of securing the appointment by the President of an advisory marketing commission. A number of conferences were held with the Secretary of Agriculture, who showed an appreciative understanding of the need of such a commission; the matter was discussed by the Cabinet, and on April 16 a conference was had with the President. The press dispatches of the following day and since have informed the public that the appointment of such an advisory body is being most favorably considered by the President and his advisers.

This shows the widespread concern in the need and the keen interest taken in the plans to meet that need. No movement was ever taken hold of more spontaneously or with greater enthusiasm by the producers. This interest and enthusiasm has developed since the middle of last September and is most encouraging evidence of what can be accomplished when the nation-wide campaign of education planned by our committee is in full operation.

Gentlemen of the Southern Commercial Congress, I have thus briefly outlined to you the plan and scope of the work of the national marketing committee. It has a special work to do in eliminating the untold wastes in distribution which in every move toward its accomplishment means an enormous increase in the prosperity and consequent purchasing power of our own people and an expansion of the home market for American manufactures and dwarfs into comparative insignificance the possibilities of the foreign markets, as important as these are and as heartily as all of us favor the extension of our foreign trade.

You will be called on to consider, and rightly so, the development of our foreign commerce and to participate in movements to secure a larger share to our merchants and manufacturers of the markets of South America, of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Germany, last year, supplied \$341,000,000 of the exports to Russia, and a great part of that business can be ours if we put forth the proper efforts. This question of capturing the world's markets is worthy of the most careful study and determined effort. I shall do all I can, as will you, to encourage and speed forward such undertaking, but I feel that I would fall short of my duty here did I not utter a word of caution and point out to you not only the far greater market right at your very door which the national marketing committee is organized to assist in opening up, but to impress upon you the stability and permanence of this enlargement of the home market and the absolute certainty it offers of belonging to our own farmers, merchants, and manufacturers for all time. This certainty may not apply to foreign markets, no matter how attractive or desirable they may be. In commerce between nations no fact is more clearly established than that the final settlement of all exchanges must be in the products of the trading nations. We sell manufactured goods to Russia. What has Russia to give in return? Mainly farm products. We have small need for these. But England and France have large demands. Germany and Austria, the most nearly self-sustaining of the large European States, also import considerable food supplies. Therefore, when peace is restored the irresistible logic of hard economic conditions will inevitably swing Russian imports from those nations that can most profitably accept Russia's agricultural exports in return.

You business men of our beloved South, whatever else you do, don't neglect the opportunity the national marketing committee offers you to increase the prosperity of our producers, thus building a solid, enduring foundation on which home markets can be enlarged, and enlarged again and again. The problems of economic distribution must be solved that there may be an end to the waste between the farm and the table, to the advantage of both producer and consumer. The opportunity is here. The national marketing committee will help this Congress create a greater Nation through a greater South. The South is well represented on its executive board. The officers of your own great organization, gentlemen of the congress, are leaders in the movement, thus insuring perfect harmony and coordination of these two large undertakings. And more than that, gentlemen, affirmative action taken by you in this will be the keynote for similar action by commercial, agricultural, and consumers' organizations throughout the entire United States. I do not speak for myself alone, but for the national marketing committee and for the commercial and farm organizations already affiliated with it. The committee will hold a meeting in Muskogee at the close of this convention, and may I not hope that this congress, so preeminently representative of the South, will give its approval to the work already accomplished and by suitable action give strength and encouragement to the work ahead? May I not even hope that every one of you gentlemen, whose devotion to the ideal of a greater Nation through a great South is shown by your presence here, will join with us and on your return home make the national marketing committee and its plans known and aid in making your community the center of an affiliated activity, earnestly determined that this great purpose shall be speedily consummated?

A TARIFF COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, for more than half a century the tariff has been the football of partisan politics in this country. In fact it has furnished the stock in trade of speakers for national office in both parties, and has even been employed by candidates for purely local offices whose views on the tariff could not by the remotest possibility have any bearing upon their qualifications for the position they sought.

I presume no man was ever elected to this House, or even became seriously a candidate for Congress, who did not have his stock speech on the subject of the tariff. We have just listened to one of those old-fashioned, stand-pat, Republican, rock-bottomed, copper-riveted speeches about the blessings of the tariff, in which it was unquestionably demonstrated that money could be extracted from the American people by means of a tariff without anyone's feeling it all, and that, therefore, it was greatly better than any possible form of direct taxation where the taxpayer could see how much he paid in his tax bill.

I have heard those arguments ever since I was a boy. I think that I made my first, last, and only tariff speech on the floor of this House two weeks after I became a Member, and, unless I was charged as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means with some special concern in making a tariff bill, I do not know any occasion that would induce me to make a tariff speech. I remember the first time that I went down to Panama our old friend, Senator Joe Blackburn, of Kentucky, was civil governor, and he told us this story. He said when he was a young lawyer in Kentucky he had a very high ambition to become a candidate for Congress. Therefore he loaded himself up with all of the great issues of the day and prepared some magnificent speeches, but, for some reason or other, he never found a fitting and appropriate occasion on which to deliver these speeches. He never could get himself before the people in the capacity of a candidate for Congress. He sought all kinds of public occasions and public gatherings, but never happened to get started exactly right. He said on one occasion he noticed in the paper that there was going to be a hanging down in the county seat; so, conjecturing correctly that there would be a very large crowd down there, he went down. Sure enough, there was the gallows in the square of the courthouse and around it five or six thousand people. He stationed himself right under the corner of the gallows.

When the sheriff brought the condemned out and stood him on the gallows he turned to the condemned and said, "Now, this is the last chance that you will have to speak any words to your fellow citizens, and I will give you time now to do so." The poor fellow shook his head and said that he did not believe he had anything to say. The sheriff said, "Now, Jim, I have known you since you were a boy and I am disposed to be as liberal with you as my duties will permit, and if you have anything to say I will give you 10 minutes now in which to make your last speech." The fellow said he was much obliged, but that he did not believe he would say anything at that time. By that time Joe Blackburn was climbing up the corner of the gallows and he said, "Hold on. If my friend here does not want to use the time allotted to him, and he will yield it to me, I would like to address my fellow citizens of Nelson County upon the subject of the tariff." The condemned turned to the sheriff and said, "Mr. Sheriff, go ahead with the hanging, for I would rather be hung and in hell than listen to Joe Blackburn talk about the tariff." [Laughter.]

The politicians have always taken themselves seriously, but the saving sense of humor of the American press has pointed out so frequently the absurdity of a candidate for constable or coroner lathering himself into a foam over the iniquities of a tariff that we are at length in danger of regarding the tariff as the stock joke of politics. The truth is that the tariff lies at the base of our whole fiscal system. The Federal Constitution gives the General Government power to sustain itself by two forms of taxation; duties on imports, and excises, or internal revenue. The exercise of its taxing power by the Federal Government must inevitably have a far-reaching influence upon the business conditions and prosperity of the country. The tariff, whether viewed as a means of raising revenue for the Federal Government, or for its incidental effect upon industrial conditions, is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, question of internal policy, but is purely a business question. The time has come to take the tariff out of politics and politics out of the tariff. This can only be done by the creation of a nonpartisan tariff commission clothed with sufficient powers to aid in the construction of a scientific revenue law.

The methods which we have pursued in the construction and enactment of tariff laws in the past have been the most unscientific, illogical, and wasteful that can be imagined. Every general revision of the tariff and even the agitation in preparation for a general revision have caused widespread business disturbance. Where nothing is certain but uncertainty business men can not adjust their affairs, invest their capital, or enlarge their enterprises. The most conservative and sound among them will curtail in every possible way their business activities until the uncertainty is turned into some form of certainty, and this causes idleness of capital, idleness of workers, and a diminished industrial power throughout the country. But bad as conditions are which precede a general revision of the tariff, the revision itself is a very carnival of confusion. Milton must have been thinking of a general revision of the tariff when he wrote:

Chaos umpire sits, and by decision more embroils the fray by which it reigns.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. What do you want of a tariff commission if you do not propose to revise the tariff?

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will bear with me, I will show him what we want with it. I think a tariff commission can suggest changes from time to time and prevent a general revision.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman says his party does not propose to revise the tariff?

Mr. BORLAND. I want to emphasize the danger that the gentleman and his party are now threatening the country with, and that is another general revision, which would simply mean a question of bargain and sale as to who should get the advantages out of a tariff law. Yet the gentleman's party is deliberately threatening the country with another general revision.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. We had a tariff board or tariff commission in every sense when the gentleman's party came into power, and you abolished it. Why do you want another?

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. We never had a tariff board, and I will show him why. And the gentleman was distinctly opposed to it and fought the tariff commission in the Sixty-first Congress.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me to again interrupt him?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman is just as near right on that as he is on any statement. I was always in favor of it and am now.

Mr. BORLAND. In favor of a tariff commission?

Mr. FORDNEY. A tariff board or a tariff commission or whatever you may call it, a committee to collect information for the benefit of Congress in framing a tariff law.

Mr. BORLAND. I am glad to welcome the gentleman to our ranks.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Michigan probably would not insist that he is in favor of the kind of nonpartisan tariff board or commission that would be appointed by a partisan President?

Mr. BORLAND. Why, of course not.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Indiana and myself are perfectly familiar with what the gentleman from Michigan is talking about. Some gentlemen were appointed by President Taft under a clause in the Payne-Aldrich bill giving him power to determine whether nations were discriminating against us and to enforce the maximum and minimum clause. That board, so called, was to report to the President and nobody else, and the gentleman is calling that, and has called it in the past, a tariff commission. It is as far removed from a tariff commission as it could possibly be, and it is only an imposition upon the business public when you call that a tariff commission.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The law itself provided that the tariff board should gather information and submit the same to the President.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; to the President.

Mr. FORDNEY. And the President in turn submitted it to Congress.

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, no; there is no such provision in the law.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes—

Mr. BORLAND. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the law provided no such thing.

Mr. FORDNEY. Pardon me, my friend, if the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I will permit the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. The President did submit to Congress each and every report made by the tariff board—

Mr. BORLAND. But the law did not compel him.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me state the question—each and every report made by that board, and the gentleman's party declined to use that information when it framed the Underwood tariff law, from a nonpartisan board, consisting of two Democrats and three Republicans.

Mr. BORLAND. The President submitted only what he saw fit.

Mr. FORDNEY. He submitted all of the reports the board made.

Mr. BORLAND. Not a bit was under the control of Congress, but under the control of a partisan President.

Mr. FORDNEY. Every word reported by that tariff board was reported to Congress. I have a copy of those reports, and the gentleman can get them.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield, although I am not making the speech.

Mr. BORLAND. I will yield.

Mr. BARNHART. Was there anything in that law that required the President of the United States to report to Congress what the tariff commission reported to him?

Mr. FORDNEY. Whether it was in the law or not, the President did do so.

Mr. BARNHART. But I am just asking for information. Was there anything—

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not think the language is in the law compelling him to submit the board's findings to Congress, but he did submit them.

Mr. BORLAND. I can say the law did not compel him.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not think it did—

Mr. BORLAND. Of course—

Mr. FORDNEY (continuing). But the President did make reports of what was reported to him.

Mr. BORLAND. It was for the information of the President, and what the President did with that was entirely within his own volition, and the amount of information laid before the board was entirely within the control of the board and the President.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Congress had no power over it. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. For just a brief statement of the facts.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The tariff law gave to the President certain power, and an item in the sundry civil bill was reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations a good deal broader than the power given in the tariff law. I happened to be Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union at the time, and a point of order was made upon the item in the sundry civil bill to create a tariff board, and I sustained the point of order. There was no provision of law for it. An amendment was then offered again for another provision to create a tariff board, and another point of order was made, and, as I recall, again sustained. I then, I think, probably indicated in rendering the decision what would be in order, and that item went into the bill, and thereby the tariff board was created, so far as the law provided for it.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has concluded—

Mr. MANN. I have.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a brief observation?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. That is the difficulty about a tariff-commission enactment which enables the President to name all the members of the board—it does not quiet the general apprehension in the country that politics is engaged in the formation of tariff bills. When this one tariff board was appointed, as I remember, three members of the Republican Party were named who were good, stiff, high-tariff protectionists, and the members credited to the Democratic Party were composed of one excellent gentleman, a former Member of Congress, who had been thoroughly discredited by his party in his own district because he had stood with the Republicans for high protection, and the other a veterinary surgeon, of somewhere, who declared that he had not voted the Democratic ticket since 1892. These two represented, or misrepresented, the Democrats on that tariff commission, and the same might be true if a Democratic President were to appoint a tariff commission. The danger of it is that if you do not have a bipartisan tariff commission you will be left exactly where we were under the Taft commission, with the party in power doubting what the commission has done for those numerically opposed to it and business suffering the same old doubt and hesitancy.

Mr. BORLAND. I hope to show the House further the difference between the so-called Tariff Board and what is now proposed.

I have served in Congress during two general revisions of the tariff and hope never to see another general revision in this country. These revisions were framed upon opposing theories, but the incidental confusion was almost as great in producing a tariff for revenue as a tariff designed for protection. In this respect, however, the tariff for protection is a shade worse than the other, for during the construction of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law business men were not only agitated on the subject of what duty should be levied upon the goods which

they produced, but were further distressed and alarmed for fear that by ignorance or craft some jokers would be slipped into the bill which would injuriously affect them by discrimination against their products or by increasing the cost of production or conferring some unjust advantage upon competing lines of business. The proposal to levy a tariff upon zinc ore not only agitated the miner, but was desperately fought at one time by the smelters and at another time by the manufacturers of brass goods and galvanized cornices. No business man felt safe in attending strictly to his own business, but was dragged, willingly or unwillingly, into the political maelstrom by what he feared might be a lurking danger to his commercial life.

I favored a tariff commission at that time. I favored it again when the Democrats had carried the National Congress in 1910, and I voted for the bill which then passed Congress, and I favor it more at the present time in view of the world-wide changes which we can all see are impending in commercial affairs. To-day the American business men are almost a unit in demanding a nonpartisan tariff commission. Such a commission is not only necessary to the construction of a tariff which is avowedly designed for the purpose of protection, but it is even more necessary to the proper formation of one which shall be a steady and scientific source of revenue.

Unfortunately in the creation of such a commission we have very little to guide us at the present time for the reason that no commission exists in this country or any other which fits the present conception of the American business world. When Germany was engaged in constructing the tariff of 1902 the first step was the appointment of a commission of 30 members, 5 of whom were representatives of the Association of Chambers of Commerce, 5 of the Central Association of Manufacturers, 5 of the German Agrarian Association, and the remaining 15 appointed by the chancellor. No attempt was made to secure a nonpartisan membership on this commission. It engaged in the collection of statistics upon the cost and facilities for production of the various commodities in Germany, including the cost of raw material, whether agricultural or mineral, and the factors which entered into the extension of German trade into foreign countries. After their data were collected they worked in conjunction with the federal council upon the formation of schedules, classifications, and rates. The tentative law thus prepared was submitted to the study of the various States and free cities comprising the German Empire, and after more than two years' of work and various modifications, after ample information and opportunity for discussion, the revenue law was adopted. Possibly this is the nearest approach to the really scientific construction of a tariff law.

France, in December, 1907, referred its present tariff law to the local councils in the various Provinces. In 1914 Great Britain was on the point of entering upon a tariff revision and appointed a commission consisting of 60 representatives of important industries. According to Mr. Chamberlain, the author of the tariff-reform program, the three main objects were: First, to stimulate industry and invention by giving it greater security; second, to defend the commerce of the country against unfair competition; and, third, to place the Government in a position to deal on more equal terms with foreign nations.

In our own country a tariff commission was created under the act of 1882, with rather vague and general powers. Like many other temporary commissions created by Congress, this commission made a voluminous report after the usual expenditure of time and money, but no official sanction was attached to this report and no particular use was made of it. When Congress was about to enter upon the revision of the tariff which resulted in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, a proposal was made by the progressive element of the Republican Party to create a tariff commission. The Republican leaders indignantly and forcibly rejected this proposal and proceeded to construct the bill in the same old way. Washington was filled with alleged experts, business representatives, and many self-confessed and possibly pretended lobbyists, who spent their time in inducing business men to believe that in some way they could secure them special advantages in the proposed law or protect them against acts of threatened discrimination. Business men swarmed to the Capitol in large numbers in an attempt either to secure advantages which they believed, or pretended to believe, were necessary for their business, or to see that they got a fair deal in the distribution of favors. It was jokingly said at that time that most of the business houses of the country were left in charge of the office boy and the office cat, the head of the firm and most of his principal subordinates being engaged in dangle around the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee. The testimony given at these hearings would aston-

ish, shock, and confuse the ordinary observer. It consisted in a mass of unreliable hearsay, much of which was doubtless honestly believed by its propounders, but which was flatly contradictory in character and without the slightest attempt at justification in fact. The bill as finally constructed and passed by the House of Representatives was entirely rewritten in the Senate, as a result, it is claimed, of various compromises and trades which were almost exclusively in the hands of a single Senator. The methods and results so shocked the country that the demand for a nonpartisan tariff commission gained substantial headway among business men. The Payne-Aldrich tariff bill contained a clause providing for a maximum and minimum tariff, and giving the President power to enforce the maximum against any country found to be discriminating against American products. Under this provision he was authorized to employ certain persons.

The language of the bill was—

To secure information to assist the President in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by this section, and the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs law, the President is hereby authorized to employ such persons as may be required.

Under this authority President Taft appointed a board alleged to be experts, but who were clearly partisan in character from the very nature of their employment, and who were utterly without either the power or warrant of law to perform any act except to aid in the enforcement of the maximum and minimum tariff. It was soon found that this particular provision was unenforceable, and thereupon an attempt was made to turn this body into a tariff commission, it being naturally anxious to perpetuate itself. The impression was given to the business public that it was, in fact, a tariff commission when nothing could have been further from the truth.

In January, 1911, however, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives unanimously reported a bill to create a tariff commission and to give it proper powers and duties. This bill passed the House of Representatives, was amended in the Senate, and filibustered to death on the last day of the session, March 4, 1911.

Mind you, in January, 1911, the Ways and Means Committee unanimously reported this bill to create a tariff commission. That was after the November election of 1910, when the Democrats had carried the House for the first time in 16 years. Up to that time the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, which was Republican and headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York, the late Mr. Payne, had never brought in a bill for the creation of a tariff commission, but in January, 1911, after the people had spoken at the polls in November, 1910, the Ways and Means Committee brought in a bill for the creation of a tariff commission.

When the Democrats were coming into power there was a strong disposition in certain quarters that we should have a tariff commission.

The Underwood tariff bill was constructed in the special session of 1913, having the immediate advantage of all of the prior hearings quite recent in date and the ample discussion and analysis of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law. To some extent the same agitation preceded and accompanied the drafting of the Underwood law, although, as it was not constructed upon the theory of giving special advantages and privileges to particular businesses, a large factor in the agitation was eliminated. During the 10 months that the Underwood law was in operation preceding the outbreak of the war in Europe its results as a revenue producer were satisfactory, and no glaring mistakes were found in its schedules even by those most bitterly opposed to it.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I wanted to know what are the factors that enter into tariff legislation that you want a commission to study.

Mr. BORLAND. It depends, as the gentleman knows, on the theory of the tariff law. If we abide by the Constitution and raise revenue by the tariff, there are certain factors that enter into it. If we seek to use that revenue law as a means of discouraging the free interchange of commodities, there is a certain other set of conditions that enters it.

Mr. FESS. That is precisely what I wanted to know. Is it your idea that the tariff commission should take into consideration the factors of the cost of labor in Europe?

Mr. BORLAND. I would not limit the tariff commission to factors which I regard as important in the construction of a revenue law, I concede that to the gentleman. I would not regard it as a nonpartisan tariff commission if it were limited. The original tariff commission law was to ascertain the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. That is the sole element, apparently, that the Republican theory of tariff demands.

Mr. FESS. Not the sole. It is one of the chief elements.

Mr. BORLAND. It is one of the chief elements. But I would not limit it to my own theory of tariff, because if I did it would not be a nonpartisan tariff commission. I want to assure the gentleman that I am trying to argue for a real nonpartisan commission.

Mr. FESS. It has been said on your side of the House that the element of cost of production does not enter into tariff legislation. We think it does. Now, would your tariff commission that you want created take into consideration that element that you say does not enter into legislation on the tariff question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Would you take it in?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes, personally. If you are asking for my personal view.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. As the Constitution does not permit any body of men to make our tariff laws except the Congress of the United States, what power would you confer upon the tariff commission except to gather information upon which Congress might base its candid opinion in fixing rates in a tariff law?

Mr. BORLAND. Well, I was about to discuss that, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan. The suggestion at the present time does not proceed further than the collection of information, reliable data, governing these subjects, but I am not so sure that this is the full limit of power that Congress can confer upon a commission. I think that Congress might constitutionally go further, but there is no such suggestion now before the public. The suggestion at present is limited to the collection of data and report to Congress to permit Congress exclusively to make the schedules.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman yield there? Here is a statement that was given out yesterday as to what the commission was expected to do, and I wanted an explanation of this one paragraph:

To determine the relations between the rates of duties on raw materials and rates on finished or partially finished products.

I think the element of labor enters there.

Mr. BORLAND. I will tell you what enters there. There was an agitation before the election of 1908, a very strong agitation, in New England for a tariff reform, and governors of States were elected there upon the tariff-reform wave. This was a very remarkable thing, but when we came to analyze tariff reform in New England it was limited to this, that the duty should be taken off of raw material and put a little bit higher on the finished product. That was the tariff reform demanded by New England. If you take the duty off of raw material you are adding automatically to the duty on the finished product. If you are going to have a tariff at all you must have a tariff graduated up from the raw material to the partially finished product, and on up to the complete product for consumption. That is what that means, and there is not a worse joker in a tariff bill than taking the duty off the raw material and leaving it upon the finished product. I can only think of one thing worse, and that is taking it off the finished product and leaving it on the raw material. One is just as unscientific as the other and perhaps as defenseless.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit, that is just exactly what is in the Underwood law now. It puts the finished products from Canada on the free list and duty on the raw material.

I do not want to take too much of your time, but will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would like to read just what Mr. Taft said about the make-up of the tariff board, in answer to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] said.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has been so long on the Committee on Ways and Means and is such a distinguished leader on his side that I am glad to be courteous to him, but I may have to ask for a little additional time.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] spoke of the make-up of the tariff board by Mr. Taft. Here is what Mr. Taft said about it. I take this from the Republican campaign text-book:

I put at the head of this board Prof. Henry C. Emery, upon the recommendation of the presidents of a number of universities who were consulted. Mr. Alvin Sanders was the editor of the Breeders' Gazette, a man of the highest standing, who had devoted his life to the study of the agricultural interests of this country, while Mr. Reynolds has been for years an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Mr. Roosevelt, in charge of customs, and had become very familiar with the operation of the existing tariff and its construction. To these three I added Prof. Page, of the University of California, and then of the University of Virginia, a well-known economist, with the same general standing as

that of Prof. Emery; and Mr. W. M. Howard, a former Democratic Congressman from Georgia and admittedly one of the ablest and fairest Members of the half dozen Congresses in which he served. The make-up of the board insures nonpartisan action. The truth is that, with the exception of Mr. Howard and Mr. Reynolds, the board may be said to have no political affiliations at all.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BORLAND. I feel now that I ought to yield to my friend from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. I listened to the reading of the report of former President Taft very attentively, and I agree with the statement of the former President therein that one of the members of that board was a former prominent Member of this House and that he was a man of great ability; but, somehow, he got out of line with his party on the tariff question to such an extent that after he had the nomination by the party in his home district the people arose—and they were practically all Democrats down there—and nominated an independent and overwhelmingly defeated the Member of Congress. That is my recollection. Then the President put him on as a representative of the Democratic Party on the tariff commission.

It will be observed that in his reference to this Virginia professor Mr. Taft says he put him on because of his ability. I think he makes no reference to his politics, and I simply called attention to that, not to criticize former President Taft, but to show the fact and the possibility that no President elected by any political party can name a tariff commission that is going to be satisfactory to the opposition, and tariff agitation will go on and on as it ever has. If you give each party representation on a tariff commission, by their own selection, they will have to abide by the results they get in the commission's reports.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Missouri permit me to answer?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. In all sincerity, if the tariff board or tariff commission is permitted or expected to do more than gather information and submit it to the Congress, how is it possible to obtain a nonpartisan board? The gentleman as a Democrat sincerely and conscientiously believes in free trade or a low tariff. I as a Republican believe in a protective tariff. The gentleman and I each have our views. If you are a Democrat or a Republican, you must have an opinion or you are an imbecile. How is it possible to create a nonpartisan tariff board and select it from the two great parties?

Mr. BARNHART. I believe I have not used the word "nonpartisan." If I did, I should have said "a bipartisan board." I believe the agitation of a tariff commission comes very largely from business men of the United States who misunderstand what they are talking about.

I received some letters this morning from business men, saying that they were gratified that I had introduced at the beginning of this Congress a bipartisan tariff commission bill, and saying that they hoped it would go further and take the tariff entirely out of the hands of Congress and out of the power of politics, so that business could go on without interruption. But that can not be done under the Constitution of the United States, and it ought not to be done, for the reason that the people elect their Representatives every two years to levy taxes and make appropriations, and that gives the people the opportunity of regulating their own affairs every two years. That is the theory upon which the Constitution of the United States was founded, as I understand it. But so long as one political party, or two, for that matter, feel that they have no representation on the tariff board or tariff commission, a doubt is going to prevail in the minds of such party that the other side is not dealing squarely with them.

Mr. FORDNEY. I agree with the gentleman, and I thank him.

Mr. BORLAND. I will say, in that connection, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that even under a partisan tariff board, if it existed and was clothed with sufficient power, a great deal of information could be gathered and a great deal of difficulty could be eliminated in the formation of a tariff. I do not believe a man's views on the tariff ought to color his reports on facts which he ascertains; and, while I am arguing for a nonpartisan board, I feel that a board could be constituted, even of a partisan character, that could honestly and fairly and fully report the facts, so that I would not feel, not having given the tariff board any further powers in the last analysis, that their political complexion would be absolutely fatal to their usefulness.

It is apparent that even in times of peace when the world conditions of commerce are normal, the factors entering into the formation of tariff schedules change with more or less rapidity. New enterprises are formed and grow into commanding proportions, new sources of raw material and new

methods of adapting existing material are discovered; new and improved means of transportation are opened; new markets are created. There is a constant shifting of the courses of capital, labor, and raw material, a constant improvement both in mechanical devices and in methods of marketing. A rate of duty which would have one effect to-day may have a totally different effect in a year. A duty which would be negligible under some circumstances may by continued reduction of the margin of profit become prohibitive. A rate which would produce a substantial revenue at one stage of the world's commerce may by successive changes result in no revenue at all. So that, even if it could be relieved from all of the disgusting incidents of greed and politics a general revision of the tariff when more than 4,000 schedules are changed at the same time is the most unscientific, unsatisfactory, and disastrous method that could possibly be devised. It is both burdensome and unnecessary. A permanent tariff commission should be engaged in the constant study of all of the factors which effect the levying of duties, and these factors are as diverse as those which enter into every phase of commercial life from the individual success of a single merchant to the commercial dominance of a nation. Such a commission should have full power to gather the necessary information and should give a fair opportunity to all business men liable to be affected, either favorably or adversely, to be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 20 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. I have heard men time after time gravely and vociferously argue upon this floor about an alleged difference in the cost of labor in this country and in foreign countries that they have named—countries they have never been in—where the information they invoked was purely hearsay. They assumed that was the sole factor entering into the question of making a tariff bill. As a matter of fact there are many factors entering into the construction of a tariff bill. Often the duty exceeds the total cost of labor entering into the production of the article. We know that in most articles the vital question is not only that of labor, but of raw material, of fuel, of overhead charges, and of selling cost. I could name article after article where the selling cost is the largest percentage of the whole ultimate price.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Would not the element of cost in fuel and selling cost and other items you mention be labor?

Mr. BORLAND. No; not necessarily. How much is the percentage of selling cost in automobiles? It runs up to nearly 70 per cent in many cases. What does that include? It includes full page advertisements in the magazines; it includes exhibitions at shows; it includes joy rides for prospective customers, and it includes plate-glass windows on prominent streets. A little of it is labor, and much of it is commission. Everything on earth is figured in that selling cost.

Mr. FESS. How much of the fuel cost is labor?

Mr. BORLAND. When you speak of labor, you speak of the labor specific to that item. If you have a mind to make that kind of a sweeping classification, of course you can trace every cost down to labor, except interest and profits.

Mr. FESS. I thought you would lead us to believe that labor has not anything to do with this.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought I tried to make myself clear about that. Perhaps I was unfortunate. When I speak of labor and raw material I speak of leather coming in as raw material, and by the labor I mean the labor used in turning the leather into shoes. Of course we understand that the leather could not have been produced without labor. So there is a labor cost in the leather and also a labor cost in the cow, but the leather is the raw material as far as that particular factory is concerned.

Changes should be made from time to time in the revenue laws as necessity appears, not by any method of bargain and trade or as the reward of or punishment for political action, but upon reasons affecting the commercial development of the country. The advantages of a tariff law constructed under such auspices should be first a scientific classification of schedules to avoid confusion in administering the customs laws and to simplify the law and aid the business men in understanding it; second, an adjustment of rates in accordance with the revenue to be raised and the results to be accomplished; third, a strengthening of the National Government in the intelligent promotion of foreign

trade; fourth, adequate provision for the construction and change of commercial treaties.

I believe that a tariff commission is necessary even from the standpoint of one who believes in the fiction of protection, but it is more necessary in the successful construction of a bill to provide revenue.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman said a moment ago that the rates should be adjusted in accordance with the revenue to be raised and the results to be accomplished. What results other than revenue are to be accomplished under the theory of a Democratic tariff for revenue only?

Mr. BORLAND. I will say to the gentleman that a great many results can be accomplished.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If it is a tariff for revenue only—and you have used the word “only” in your platform—if you levy a tariff for the purposes of revenue only, for what other results do you levy it? Does the gentleman mean protection to American industry?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; you can put it that way if you choose, from the standpoint of a protective tariff.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then you must strike out the “only” from your platform.

Mr. BORLAND. I will try to answer the gentleman fairly. I am not a protectionist; but when I speak of the possibilities of a tariff board I do not eliminate that factor, so that when the gentleman smiles and sits down he has not quite got my answer. He asked me if in the results obtained I meant protection. That is what a Republican would mean in voting for a tariff board.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman said a moment ago that we should levy the duties with a view to securing revenue and other results.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What other results are to be secured under a Democratic tariff when the Democratic platform declares that it shall be levied for revenue only?

Mr. BORLAND. I will answer the gentleman. I said “other results,” as far as the Republicans are concerned, would mean protection. As far as the Democrats are concerned, the gentleman asks me whether there would be other results. Unquestionably there would, and nobody except a man who is talking about the tariff in a purely superficial political sense on the stump would pretend that there is not. No revenue duty can be levied—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin again rose.

Mr. BORLAND. Just a moment. Let me finish my answer. No revenue duty can be levied without having some effect of incidental protection. You can not levy any duty for any purpose that it does not have some effect on the question of protection. And if the gentleman will pardon me, he has asked what other results would follow, and I think I have a right to answer his question in my own way. There is another result. If you have a choice of two or more commodities upon which you may levy a duty, a great question of policy would arise as to which you would choose, even from a revenue standpoint.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says that I have asked whether other results would follow. I did not ask that. I asked an interpretation of the gentleman's own statement when he spoke of the rates which he said should be levied with a view to securing revenue and with an eye to other results. What are the other results to secure which a Democratic tariff is levied? If it must be for purposes of revenue only, then there must be no looking for other results. The Democratic Party has repeatedly declared that a tariff levied for any other purpose than to secure revenue—that is, for the protection of American industry—violates the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, I think I have answered the gentleman's question, but if I have not made it clear to him I will. I have learned by experience here in this House, in the last seven years, that even in levying a revenue tariff it is impossible to eliminate all incidental protection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is true; but—

Mr. BORLAND. Now, will the gentleman just pardon me—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I want to say that the gentleman has not answered my question. Of course there is incidental protection, but do you levy it for that purpose?

Mr. BORLAND. No.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You levy it for revenue only, but you said a moment ago that it should be levied with a view to securing revenue, and with an eye to the other results.

Mr. BORLAND. The other results; yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is, you levy it for two purposes—for revenue purposes and for the other results. What are the other results? That is my question.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, let me answer the gentleman's question again. If I believed in protection as a theory, I might seek to lay even a revenue duty so as to produce the highest possible amount of protection; but if I were distinctly opposed to protection, as I am, and desired to eliminate it as far as possible from a revenue law, I might have another set of results in mind; but I can not eliminate that result entirely, and neither can the gentleman. Nobody can construct a tariff law, and nobody ever did construct a tariff law, that did not have some incidental effect upon particular lines of business. If there is any Democrat who believes that can be done, all he has got to do is to give the matter a little more study. I have no doubt that men, before they come to this House and when they are on the stump running for constable or coroner, will get out and talk about there being no protection in a tariff law; but no tariff law can be framed which will not give some incidental protection. We are talking now as a matter of scientific study.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman refers to the question of policy, and asks whether we should levy a revenue duty on one thing or another.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman mean that any tariff board is to report to this House upon a question of policy?

Mr. BORLAND. No; but I will say what I do mean. We might have a very grave doubt in our minds as to the levying of a duty on wool or sugar. We might find that the revenue produced might be equal, but when we ascertained what the result would be from the facts reported by the tariff board, we might resolve that doubt in favor of one or the other.

Mr. SIMS. Is it not the policy of the tariff for revenue only to get the greatest amount of revenue with the least protection, and is it not the policy of the protectionists to get the greatest amount of protection with the least revenue, and does it take a board to let us know what that means?

Mr. BORLAND. No; but I will tell the gentleman why I favor a tariff board. I have seen duties levied on articles, under a Republican tariff law at least, where there was absolutely no necessity for protection, no chance for protection, where they were entirely prohibitive in character and intended to be so.

Mr. SIMS. And would have been if we had 40 tariff boards?

Mr. BORLAND. No, they would not. If they had been the public would have had ample information as to what that political party was doing.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman has stated that in the tariff for revenue only there is a purpose of incidental protection. If you are going to put me out of life by drowning me, all that is necessary is to put me one-half an inch under water, and I will drown as quickly as if I were 10 feet under water, for you shut off my breath and I am gone. Now, as the labor cost in production in any article, no matter what it is, is at least 90 per cent of the total cost, and when our labor cost is double in this country what it is in any other country in the world, unless you give enough protection to our industries to make up the difference in cost of labor between here and abroad, you will put the man out of business in this country unless he can get his labor as cheaply as they get it in other countries. Is that not right?

Mr. BORLAND. No; if that were true, or if any part of it was true, we would not be able to sell any goods outside of our own country. We would have to erect a Chinese wall around our country to keep the commercial pirates from getting in here. The fact that we are able to sell abroad demonstrates one of two things—either that the manufacturer is paying less for labor and raw material than he ought to in view of the protection he claims and therefore is able to compete with the foreign competitor in a foreign market or else he is deceiving the American people as to the conditions in foreign countries and that labor cost is not so cheap and conditions are not so poor for labor in the foreign countries that we have got to erect a tariff wall to keep their products out of the country. If what the gentleman says is so, it follows by inevitable logic that we can not go outside of this country and sell in competition with those countries. The minute that we enter the markets of the world we do it on one of two bases—either that the man who demands protection of these goods has lied about the conditions abroad that he had to compete with or he is paying an

unjust low scale of wages and for raw material in this country. That is the inevitable logic of facts as to what the protected manufacturer does to labor in this country.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the gentleman think that the price of labor must take into consideration the element of efficiency?

Mr. BORLAND. Unquestionably. Figuring out the cost of goods the criterion is not the price paid for labor but the units produced. If the factory turns out more units of product, even though it pays higher wages, the cost is correspondingly less. If wages were any criterion, why do you not go to Hindustan and make linoleum and oilcloth where the jute is raised? Why do you bring it here for our workmen, if they are not superior? Why do you not go there where they pay 18 cents a day on the Ganges? You would not bring all of the jute from Hindustan here if it was only a question of 18 cents a day wages. But you do bring it here and pay \$2.50 and \$3 a day for labor. Why? Because our workmen are more able to make the goods and you are able to put the goods down in the foreign markets in competition with the goods of other countries.

Mr. FORDNEY. Was not this done under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law?

Mr. BORLAND. Of course, goods were sold cheaper abroad than at home.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me finish my question. Was it not true that there was a protective tariff on these goods we produced, jute and everything else?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I suppose that is true.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman may be right in some of his theories; I do not say that he is not. Prior to the war in Europe, Germany sold abroad her fabricated steel as low as \$18 a ton, and yet she sold to her own people in Germany that same fabricated steel for \$30 a ton. She dumped her surplus abroad, crushing out of existence her competitors.

Mr. BORLAND. Well, I am going to take the statement of the gentleman from Michigan as being absolutely correct. Then, upon what basis do the German manufacturers pay wages; on the basis of \$18 a ton, or on the basis of \$30 a ton?

Mr. FORDNEY. It was shown by the testimony furnished the Ways and Means Committee that the German scale of wages, although her labor is the most efficient in the world, is less by one-half than that paid in the steel mills of the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. The wage scale then was fixed on a basis of a sale at \$18 a ton outside of Germany. Therefore the price of \$30 at home did not put a nickel into the pockets of the German workmen.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not contend that it did.

Mr. BORLAND. But that is the contention of the gentleman's party, that part of this tariff goes into the pockets of the workingman.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know what their actual cost per ton is, but I do know what the actual cost per ton in this country is, and that the cost of labor in the production of a ton of steel in the United States is 80 per cent of its total cost.

Mr. BORLAND. Can we not compete with Germany in the production of steel?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; and we do not. The testimony given by Mr. Schwab under oath was to the effect that there had not been one pound of steel rails sold by any American steel manufacturer in any steel-producing country in the world in 10 years, except a little that was sold in northwestern Canada, and that steel brought to the American manufacturer \$2 per ton above the price that it was sold for in the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. Is the gentleman confessing now that he makes a tariff on the testimony of Mr. Schwab? That is exactly what we want a tariff commission for.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would take his word under oath as quickly as I would that of anyone else.

Mr. BORLAND. Is it not a fact that American steel is sold abroad?

Mr. FORDNEY. Can the gentleman give me any reason why I should not believe Mr. Schwab under oath?

Mr. BORLAND. I can; and that is that the facts are to be ascertained entirely from nonprejudiced and disinterested sources.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, be fair.

Mr. BORLAND. I am sincere about that. I do not think the sworn statement of a manufacturer is the only evidence.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell my friend that I am just enough of a Christian believer that I will believe any man under oath until it can be proven that he is a falsifier.

Mr. BORLAND. Then it would be necessary to prove that he is a liar.

Mr. FORDNEY. Can the gentleman prove that Mr. Schwab was mistaken when he made that statement? If so, I want him to prove it to me.

Mr. BORLAND. My Christianity leads me to hear both sides before I judge, and not to accept an ex parte statement of an interested witness.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want to state the other side.

Mr. BORLAND. But I will have to have more time.

Mr. RAINEY. I will ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. Make it 15.

Mr. RAINEY. Make it 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I must reserve the right to object. We have some reports from the Committee on Printing that are of importance to the House, and I doubt whether we can settle the whole tariff question this afternoon.

Mr. RAINEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to have the five minutes for myself.

Mr. MANN. But we gave the gentleman 15 minutes and he would not use it. We have horse books and cow books that are of much more importance to the House than an academic discussion of the tariff, which no one will agree with on either side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. I want to say to my friend from Michigan that if Mr. Schwab did make a statement of that kind—I do not remember it—the proof can be easily ascertained that he was stating what was not true. At that time there was a world trust in steel prices, an agreement throughout the world that the steel-producing countries would not interfere with each other; that no American steel was to be sold in Germany and no German fabricated steel in the United States. They divided up between them the debatable ground in the countries of South America and Africa, where there were no steel industries.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, the gentleman is wrong in that.

Mr. RAINEY. I think not.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman furnish some evidence of that combination or trust that he speaks of? I never heard of it except from the lips of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I must decline to yield further.

As to the powers of such a commission, the suggestion goes no further than that it be clothed with power to ascertain and determine the facts upon which the schedules should be based. The present method of determining the facts by hearings before the committees of Congress at rare intervals is bound to be burdensome, unscientific, and unsatisfactory. The cost of such a commission would be saved to the American business man in time, expense, and gain of productive power. There are two factors in the present situation of the civilized world which make imperative the creation of such a commission at this time. The first is the existence of the European war and the second is the necessity for the expansion of American foreign commerce. No economist doubts that immediately after the conclusion of peace in Europe each of the great nations must begin a reconstruction of its entire fiscal policy, and especially that with relation to tariff duties.

It is freely predicted that the clash of arms will be followed by a commercial warfare in which the ammunition will be legislation authorizing or encouraging commercial reprisals. Wisdom dictates that among our other plans of preparedness we should be prepared for this commercial struggle. Commercial treaties the world over must all be recast. Commercial discriminations must be expected and relentless competition encouraged by national power may easily become the settled policy of nations which find their industries impoverished by the long struggle. Not only will the neutral markets of the world be the prey of these forces but even our own markets will be attacked. There may be no open door in China, and, in fact, no open door anywhere that any nation has the power to close. The doors of national trade may open only to the skillfully constructed key of a commercial treaty, and such a treaty must be founded upon an intelligent grasp of the commercial and industrial possibilities of the country which offers

it and the country to which it is offered. We in America are woefully deficient not only in our grasp of foreign trade conditions but even of our own commercial possibilities. Our long adherence to the protective tariff has made us provincial and for more than two generations limited the bulk of our foreign trade to exports of raw material which we sold at highly competitive prices.

This leads to the second thought, which is that, even if the war had not come but certainly in view of the present world situation, America must prepare to expand her foreign commerce. The babes in the woods were not more helpless than we have been in the past in writing commercial treaties. I may be mistaken, but I do not know of a single commercial treaty in which we have not been placed at a disadvantage. In the last decade American trade has undergone a great change. From an exporter of raw material we have become an exporter of manufactured goods. Manufactured goods are upon a different basis of competition from raw material. Foreign nations would always take our cotton and our wheat at some price, but no nation will buy our manufactured goods unless we not only meet our competitors in quality and price but cultivate some of the arts of salesmanship. The neutral markets of the world lie ready for our enterprise, but we can not blindly and blunderingly erect a tariff wall around our country keeping out the products of all other nations and expect them to come and buy our goods when we buy nothing from them.

International trade is reciprocal; even a line of steamers or other transportation facilities must have a load each way. If we expect South America to buy from us, we must be prepared to take some of their products at prices and under conditions which are attractive to them. The great question, therefore, affecting the future of American prosperity in securing a foreign trade in neutral markets is what products of foreign countries can we safely take. What can we use in this country to the advantage of our own capital and our own labor and what may we give in exchange of the output of our own industries. It is an economic loss for us to send abroad wheat in competition with some of the South American countries when with our supply of fuel, capital, and labor we could manufacture the wheat into flour or, better still, into packed biscuits and bread-stuffs and sell it to many of the same South American countries. If we take the rubber, hardwood, and forest products of South America, are we not providing the raw material upon which to use our capital and our labor, and can not we sell to them furniture, pianos, automobiles, belting, mining machinery, and other products of our factories?

It is not suggested at this time that the tariff commission should be given the power to fix rates or even to suggest them. Congress has exclusive power of legislation and is charged by the Federal Constitution with levying taxes, including duties upon imports. There are some who urge that the tariff commission is unconstitutional as a delegation of legislative power which Congress can not make. No such charge can be leveled against the suggested plan. In fact, the plan could go much further and still be within the constitutional powers of Congress. It would be possible for Congress to prescribe a series of alternative rates or a maximum and minimum schedule of rates and confer power upon the commission, upon the ascertainment of certain facts, to put in force or to suspend from operation certain portions of the law. This is now well settled by the decision of the Supreme Court. A provision which occurred in the McKinley tariff law of 1890, authorizing the President to suspend the free admission of sugar when he deemed the United States discriminated against by any country, was sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Field against Clark* (143 U. S., 649-692), Lamar and Fuller dissenting.

The Congress may not delegate its purely legislative power to a commission, but having laid down the general rules of action under which a commission shall proceed it may require of that commission the application of such rules to particular situations and the investigation of facts with a view to making orders in a particular matter within the rules laid down by the Congress (*I. C. C. v. Goodrich Transit Co.*, 224 U. S., 194-214; *K. C. S. Ry. v. U. S.*, 231 U. S., 423-443.)

It would seem that Congress might enact a standard schedule of tariff rates and provide for the increase or reduction of rates according to a sliding scale depending either on revenue receipts on or the rates of imports to domestic consumption, or on some other principle, while delegating to a commission the work of determining the facts and applying the law to them. The orders of a tariff commission would be reviewable by the courts on questions of law only, not on questions of fact. They would be analogous in this respect to regulations of the Treasury Department under the present tariff law, or to tariff provisions contingent upon the determination of certain facts by the President as was provided in the Payne-Aldrich law.

I know that the proposal to establish a permanent tariff commission and take the tariff out of politics will come as a distinct shock to some gentlemen who think that the tariff is the only bond of party unity and must be preserved as a partisan issue. However, the time has gone by when the American business public will tolerate that brand of politics. Business men, large or small, throughout the country to-day are demanding a tariff commission. The cry is let there be light, and any statesman or politician who opposes a nonpartisan tariff commission lays himself under the suspicion of playing politics with a great business question. The present session of Congress will, I believe, pass a bill providing for such a commission, and in so doing will place another star in the diadem of Democracy as an exponent of progressive American Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISEASES OF THE HORSE.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read. The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 13 (H. Rept. 88).

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 for the use of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

SPECIAL REPORT ON DISEASES OF CATTLE.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer another privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 14 (H. Rept. 89).

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 copies for use of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 11 (H. Rept. 91).

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles, be printed as a House document, and that 5,000 additional copies be printed, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 1,500 copies for the use of the commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana what this report will cost?

Mr. BARNHART. The Clerk has the report of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Printing having had under consideration the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) providing for the printing of 5,000 copies of the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to. The estimated cost will be \$7,851.39. The unencumbered balance of the allotment for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, is \$789,378.26.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if this report has been printed by the department?

Mr. BARNHART. It has not.

Mr. FOSTER. Then may I inquire what particular advantage there will be in getting this report printed at this time as a House document?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Houston], who is the author of the bill.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois I want to say that the act providing for the construction of the Alaska Railway provided that the agents and officers appointed by the President to build and construct that railroad should make an annual report of their doings in the premises, of their work, to the President of the United States, and that report should be submitted to Congress annually, and oftener if it was required by the President. This is an annual report made, and it is a showing that it is important that every Member of the House should see and also every Member of the Senate. It is carrying out a law which involves a new work in a new field on which the Government has embarked. It fully sets forth what has been accomplished already, and it will acquaint the Members of Congress as to what has been done with the money that Congress has appropriated for this purpose. And I think it very important, in order that Congress may understand thoroughly what has been done in this great enterprise, that this report be put in the hands of Congress.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the gentleman inform the House in reference to the maps which it is stated shall be printed in this report? What kind of maps are they, and how many of them, and what is likely to be the cost of printing?

Mr. MANN. It can not be very large if the whole amount is \$7,800.

Mr. HOUSTON. I can not give the exact proportion, but it provides for the printing of maps, charts, and profiles in such forms that will be serviceable. Now, it is very important, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, that we have those maps and these charts, because it will be impossible to understand thoroughly what they are doing and what work is accomplished, and its character without these maps and charts in order to get the location and geographical situation in order to give a clear conception of just what has been done.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I take it this first report shows the line of road they have purchased up there, and also as far as they have got the line of the continuation of that road?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, sir. This report shows that. It shows the road, and it shows the condition of the road they purchased; it states fully as to the purchase of that road just what it cost, and so forth. It states also the cost of construction of the road that has been built beyond the end of its line that has been bought.

Mr. MANN. What is the total limit of cost of this Alaska road?

Mr. HOUSTON. Thirty-five million dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say—I think my colleague anticipated something what I was going to say when he interrupted with his question—I want to say this: That this road is to cost \$35,000,000 and the commission has to report to Congress the first annual report that is to be made, I do not know whether we ought each year to print a report of this kind or not, but I do believe that at least at this time we should know something of what is being done and I shall not object under those circumstances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer an amendment to the resolution. I move to amend by striking out the word "two," in line 8, and insert the word "three" instead; and by striking out the words "five hundred," in lines 9 and 10; and by striking out the words "five hundred," in line 11, thereby allowing 3,000 to the House, 1,000 to the Senate, and 1,000 to the commission.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentleman be willing to increase the number from 5,000 to 6,000 and give that additional number to the House without interfering with the balance? This is one of the most interesting things that the Government has ever undertaken, something akin to the construction of the Panama Canal.

I am very sure that there are many people in the country—engineers, librarians, and so forth—very much interested in a report like this. It never will be reprinted. I think the department ought to have 1,500 copies, and as the resolution provided for 2,000 copies for the House and 1,500 for the Senate, and we are at least entitled to twice the number the Senate has, I think we ought to increase our number to 3,000, and even then each Member will receive a very small quota of a document that in many places will be very greatly in demand.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask to withdraw the amendment and offer the following, instead:

Amend by inserting the word "six" instead of "five" in line 7.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNHART. And also by inserting the word "three" instead of "two," in line 8, and by striking out "five hundred" in line 11.

Mr. MANN. You do not have to strike out anything.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the resolution reported as amended, so that we will know exactly what it is.

The SPEAKER. We will have the amendment read first, and then we will have the whole thing read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution with the amendments included.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 11.

Resolved, etc., That the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles, be printed as a House Document, and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 for the use of the Senate, and 1,500 copies for the use of the commission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

MEDICO-MILITARY ASPECTS OF THE EUROPEAN WAR.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 12 (H. Rept. 92).

Resolved, etc., That there be printed and bound 10,000 copies of the Report on the Medico-Military Aspects of the European War by Surg. A. M. Fauntleroy, United States Navy, 6,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 3,000 for the use of the Senate and an additional 1,000 copies for the use of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] if the department has the money for printing these reports; and, if so, why the necessity for coming to the House and printing them out of the amount appropriated for the printing for Congress?

Mr. BARNHART. This is out of the usual work of the Navy Department, because it will not be used for the Navy Department alone, but for the benefit of the War Department and for the benefit of the people of the country generally. I thought of that phase of the situation, but it seemed to me that this is an exceptional case, and I believe that at this time, when we are talking so much of preparation and the great necessity of getting ready, we can not have too much information, inasmuch as it is as inexpensive as this seems to be.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that I think it is an important document and ought to be printed. The only thing is that we get the departments in the habit of coming to Congress and having a lot of printing done.

Mr. MANN. The department did not ask for this.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not mean that, possibly, but I mean it is done by Congress out of an appropriation allowed it for printing instead of the amount that was appropriated to the department for printing. However, I am not going to object to this.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee what rule his committee follows in the apportionment of volumes for the use of the Members of the House and those of the Senate? This resolution, I notice, is reported as introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Edmonds], granting to the House only twice the number allotted to the Senate, whereas our membership is more than four times as large.

Mr. BARNHART. In reply to the gentleman I will say that the usual proportion is 70 to 30, and if he desires to offer an amendment in that proportion, it will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will it be satisfactory to make it 8 to 2? Mr. MANN. The usual proportion ever since I have been here has been 2 to 1.

Mr. BARNHART. Two to one.

Mr. STAFFORD. The usual proportion ever since the gentleman has been here has been 2 to 1, but the membership of the House has been changing more greatly than the membership of the Senate.

Mr. MANN. I am not so sure there has been so much difference since I have been here.

Mr. STAFFORD. The membership when the gentleman came here was 356, and now it is 435.

Another matter I would like to direct the attention of the gentleman to is as to whether the resolution as introduced provides for the printing of 10,000 or 11,000 copies. I direct his attention to the phraseology in next to the last line, which says, "And an additional 1,000 copies"; there being in the body of the resolution provision made for the distribution of 9,000, and an additional 1,000 for the use of the Navy Department.

Mr. BARNHART. I think in order to make it perfect the word "additional" should be stricken out, and if there is no objection, I shall ask that it be done.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the suggestion as to the distribution, because I really think the House ought to have a larger quota than the 2 to 1?

Mr. BARNHART. I am just submitting to the gentleman that if he wants to offer an amendment I will not offer any objection, but this is the proportion the gentleman used in writing the bill. He evidently had made some investigation, and it is a document that will be of nation-wide importance, and doubtless all called for, however it may be distributed. If they can not get them from a Member of the House, they can get them from a Senator.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will not in this instance offer an amendment, but I do hope that when gentlemen introduce resolutions in the future they will bear in mind the fact of the larger membership of the House and the demand upon Members for documents.

Mr. MANN. The Senate and the House do not always agree about these things. The Senate passed some resolutions the other day for a horse book and a cattle book, and they proposed to take, I will not say most of them, but about half of them. Now, the House is sending over a proposition to the Senate, and we in turn are trying to "hog" it. Ever since I have been here my experience has been that once in a while such a resolution gets in inadvertently, but if it is important the House gets two-thirds and the Senate one-third.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the other resolutions we are getting more than two-thirds.

Mr. MANN. That has not passed the Senate yet. They have taken nearly half themselves.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee just wanted to show a strong front.

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman offer another amendment?

Mr. BARNHART. I did not know that unanimous consent had been granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the words "an additional," in line 7.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7 of the resolution strike out the words "an additional."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION OF CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 80 (H. Rept. 93).

Resolution for printing 10,000 copies of the report of the investigation of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the financial affairs of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.

Resolved, That there be printed 10,000 copies of the report of the investigation of the Interstate Commerce Commission with reference

to the financial transactions, history, and operation of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., being No. 6834 of the docket of said commission.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARNHART, from the Committee on Printing, makes the following report (to accompany H. Res. 80):

The Committee on Printing, having had under consideration the House resolution (H. Res. 80) providing for the printing of 10,000 copies of the report of the investigation of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the financial affairs of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to.

The estimated cost will be \$107.92.

The unencumbered balance of the allotment for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, is \$787,378.26.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FOSTER. In the urgent deficiency bill there was given the Interstate Commerce Commission \$10,000 for additional printing. It seems to me that this is a case purely of Congress providing out of its appropriation for printing a document that comes from the Interstate Commerce Commission; and, so far as I am concerned at this time, in view of the fact that we have appropriated \$10,000 as an urgent deficiency for the Interstate Commerce Commission, unless it is shown that this amount to print these reports on the Rock Island Railroad investigation is a proper thing, I could not this afternoon permit this to go through without some further explanation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I was in hope of inducing the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] to withdraw any objection he might have.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is not the Interstate Commerce Commission that is asking for the printing of the report of this investigation. This report was printed in the same manner as the report of other decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission. There were something like three or four thousand copies printed originally, which were sent to its mailing list and Members of Congress and used up in that manner, until only about 150 copies remained, being used in the ordinary and customary manner of the Interstate Commerce Commission. There was a good deal of demand for the report, and, although I wrote down at once for some twenty copies of the report, I was unable to obtain them.

The importance of having the report printed lies in this, that it is an official record condensed of the evidence taken before the Interstate Commerce Commission showing the most gigantic robberies ever committed on any corporation engaged in interstate commerce. It shows facts utterly unbelievable. If a man went out on the stump or stated it on the floor of this House he would not be believed if he was not backed up by the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission after proper investigation and hearings on both sides in relation to the matter.

In the further consideration of the matters before this House there undoubtedly will come bills for issuance of securities, bills for the control of corporation carriers in interstate commerce, bills in relation to holding companies, especially involved in this investigation, and other matters which may all be combined in one bill or may be brought before this House by several bills. The Members of the House, I am satisfied, and the country at large want to absolutely know what are the real facts in the case, and it is impossible that they should be informed unless we have some such method as this. The amount involved is trifling; it is less than \$100. I think that the committee states the cost is \$101, but I had supposed it would only cost \$75. If we can not get 10,000 copies printed, I would take 5,000. This is of the highest importance, and the report should be printed. I know, when I went before the Committee on Interstate Commerce and stated to them that the reports which were being issued by the directors of that company at that time were not within \$10,000,000 of being correct, that there had been stolen between seven and eight million dollars out of the treasury of the company, they looked at me with incredulity.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ADAMSON. I understand from the gentleman that he is asking for a print here because it is impossible to secure the print from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ADAMSON. I remember that the gentleman applied to me, and I advised him to introduce a resolution and have it referred to the Committee on Printing. I take great pleasure

in stating for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois that if it had come within my jurisdiction I should have recognized the necessity and advised the printing.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman that I have had a communication from two Senators asking if there would be a favorable report on this resolution, and if not, they would introduce it in the Senate, so that it makes little difference whether it is printed here or not, except that if it is printed here the Members of the House will have the use of it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I wish to say that the Senate has ordered 10,000 copies of the investigation of the New Haven Railroad printed and 1,000 additional for some special purpose, making a total of 11,000 in all, and of the two this is the more important.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] if this is the subject about which he made a speech in the House some time ago?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The same subject on which I made the speech in the House.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then permit me to say that I heard that speech, in which the gentleman narrated in detail frauds of corporate management which, as he said, were almost unbelievable. I believed that they had been perpetrated because many of the things the gentleman stated in great detail as a part of his own personal knowledge and experience. This report being the result of the investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of a subject so important to the shippers of the West and to the Congress of the United States in perfecting the legislation it is expected to enact, I sincerely hope that the report will be printed and made accessible.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield.

Mr. FOSTER. I fully agree with all the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Wisconsin have said. In my judgment, there has been no greater fraud committed on the American people than the looting of the Rock Island Railroad. It has been a scandal and a disgrace to the business world. They ruined the great Rock Island Railroad that ran through a section of the Western States. This road at one time was the finest in Illinois. But a lot of men got hold of that property and stole from it until there came the great crash, which has brought such a disastrous result to it. There is no question about that. The only thing to which I wish to call the attention of the House at this time is that not many days ago we gave an additional appropriation for printing, which can be used by the Interstate Commerce Commission for this very purpose. We gave them \$10,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FOSTER. Just a moment. It seems to me that under circumstances of this kind the resolution ought not to pass; and while I agree with all that gentlemen have said, and while I would agree to more than they have said—because I have known something about the management of the Rock Island Railroad—yet I do not believe this is a proper way to get these reports printed. It should be done by the Interstate Commerce Commission. One day we give this commission \$10,000, and they have charge of these matters and can print these reports if they will and if they are of such great importance, as I know they are.

Mr. ADAMSON. If my friend from Illinois will yield, I wish to say to him that the resolution for an investigation came to our committee. We had exhaustive hearings, and developed things as bad or worse than gentlemen have intimated here this afternoon. To show the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] that I have the question of economy at heart as much as he has, I will state to him that our committee suggested to the Interstate Commerce Commission that instead of duplicating the expense by having a long and expensive special investigation they expedite the investigation of this railroad in their physical valuation proceedings. They agreed with us, and said that. They have made the investigation and have printed the ordinary quota of this report—as many copies as they ever print in ordinary cases. Now they have taken the position that they ought not to print any more. The amount allowed them in the urgent deficiency bill is to cover the expense of their ordinary printing, and they absolutely refuse to print a larger number of copies of the report. So the only remedy of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] was to come to the House and ask us to print, for the benefit of Members, the necessary copies which the Interstate Commerce Commission refused to print. The expense is very small in comparison with the amount that our committee saved to the Government by refusing a special in-

vestigation and adopting the other expedient. So I think the gentleman from Illinois ought not to object.

Mr. FOSTER. That situation came up and the gentleman managed it the way he states, which I think was a wise thing to do. We have this evidence, which is valuable to the House. But that is not the question I am discussing. There are a thousand things that are valuable to the House, and yet it seems to me there is a right way to get at them. I am not saying a thing in the world against the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] for bringing in this report, because I think he did what he believed to be the right thing to do, and he is careful as to expenditures for printing. I do not like to object to these things that the House thinks necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FOSTER. In just a moment. Let me finish what I am going to say and then I shall be through. I wish to say this, that I am not going to make any serious objection to the passage of this resolution, as I might do at this time by raising the point of no quorum, at this late hour in the evening, when there are so few Members here, and so prevent the passage of the resolution to-night. But, so far as I am concerned, in the future, unless a very exceptional reason can be shown, when Congress makes an appropriation for printing, as it has done in this case, and then gives an additional \$10,000 in an urgent deficiency appropriation bill—and I do not know how much more will be appropriated in the general deficiency bill—I shall object to every one of these resolutions going through and shall do whatever I can to defeat them.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the remarks just made by the gentleman from Illinois, with which I agree in a general way, I want to state for the information of the gentleman and for the information of the House, that the Committee on Printing has been as diligent as possible in attempting to prevent the reporting of resolutions of the kind to which the gentleman from Illinois refers. The chairman of the Printing Committee has from time to time objected to unanimous consent for resolutions providing for the printing of reports for departments when such resolutions have been offered on the floor of the House. But here comes a little report, the cost of printing of which will be inconsequential, a report which is important for the information of the country, which the committee believes the Interstate Commerce Commission probably would not distribute as well as the Members of the House, and therefore we decided to report favorably the resolution, and I hope that the resolution will pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting list of cases which were dismissed by the court under the act of March 4, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 630); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.
2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting facts relating to estimates of appropriations (p. 806, Book of Estimates for 1917) for printing and binding for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 631); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.
3. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting draft of a proposed joint resolution authorizing the Department of Labor to edit and publish certain studies turned over to said department by the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations (H. Doc. No. 632); to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.
4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting that the Navy Department has considered, ascertained, and adjusted and determined that \$155.06 is due G. W. Webber and J. H. Thomas for damages for which a vessel of the Navy was responsible (H. Doc. No. 633); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.
5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required for the service

of the War Department for barracks and quarters, Philippine Islands, repair and restoration of buildings destroyed by storms (H. Doc. No. 634); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (S. J. Res. 76) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 1,000 tents and 1,000 cots for the use of the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held at Birmingham, Ala., in May, 1916, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 90), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3415) granting a pension to Maggie Barron; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4361) granting an increase of pension to Michael Nolan; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2779) granting a pension to John R. Malone; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10385) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 10386) to tax munitions of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCracken: A bill (H. R. 10387) for the improvement of the Columbia River to the mouth of Snake River within the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho; for the improvement of the Snake River to Pittsburg Landing, on said river; and for the improvement of the Clearwater River from its mouth to Orofino, in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10388) permitting railroad companies to grant half-fare rates over their lines to Union soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KINKAID (by request): A bill (H. R. 10389) to provide for pensions for surviving soldiers of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 10390) to provide for the giving of notice of suits and proceedings in courts of the United States affecting the title to real property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 10391) prescribing the procedure in the courts of the United States in actions at law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10392) in relation to the service of process by United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 10393) to redistribute jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture over the protection of fur-bearing animals in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 10394) providing for co-operation with the State of New Mexico in the construction of roads within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10395) making appropriation for the repair and preservation of the Rio Grande in certain counties in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 10396) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the establishment of a naval and aviation academy on the Pacific coast of the United States within 150

miles of San Francisco, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 10397) to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10398) to provide for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other benefits and purposes in connection therewith; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10399) authorizing postmasters to give information as to addresses of patrons of their office in certain cases; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10400) to provide for the advancement of funds to survey, construct, and maintain roads and trails within any State or the Territory of Alaska within which national forests are located; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10401) to regulate the use of public lands of the United States in certain counties in Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 10402) granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGSDALE: A bill (H. R. 10403) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Dillon, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 10404) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Two Rivers, in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 10405) for securing the uniform grading of grain, preventing deception in transactions in grain, and regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 10406) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Menasha, in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10407) providing for the erection of a suitable memorial to John Fitch; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RAGSDALE: A bill (H. R. 10408) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Conway, Horry County, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10409) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Hartsville, Darlington County, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10410) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Kingstree, Williamsburg County, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 10411) to establish a fish-cultural station in the county of Koochiching, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10412) creating an Army reserve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 10413) to appropriate \$150,000 for the improvement of navigation on Red River in Louisiana and Arkansas; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 10414) to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 10415) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the establishment of a military aviation academy within the State of Utah, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10416) granting to the State of Utah the Fort Duchesne Reservation for its use as a branch agricultural college; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 10417) creating and establishing a commission to be known as the Merchant Marine Commission, prescribing its duties and powers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAYES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) amending the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 123) authorizing the Sergeants at Arms of the House and Senate to supply each Member of Congress with an identification insignia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: Resolution (H. Res. 113) taxing munitions of war, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of Legislature of State of Rhode Island, urging upon the Congress of the United States the duty of adequately increasing the naval and military forces of this Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of Legislature of Rhode Island, urging upon the Congress of the United States the duty of adequately increasing the naval and military forces of this Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial urging upon the Congress of the United States the duty of adequately increasing the military and naval forces of this Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 10418) granting an increase of pension to George Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10419) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10420) for the relief of the legal representatives of O. M. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 10421) for the relief of A. J. Hodges, T. W. Hodges, and C. C. Hodges; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 10422) granting an increase of pension to Janet Lamoreux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10423) granting a pension to Marietta Brewer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 10424) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Waldrop; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10425) granting a pension to Pollock T. Harbold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 10426) for the relief of B. S. Pearsall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 10427) to reimburse William Blair for losses and damages sustained by him by the negligent dipping of his cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 10428) granting a pension to Susan A. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10429) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 10430) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Joseph Houser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 10431) granting a pension to Ellen J. Lehw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 10432) granting a pension to Frank B. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 10433) granting a pension to Mary B. Chatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 10434) for the relief of the estate of Absa Sherrill; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10435) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Birley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10436) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Fiero; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 10437) to correct the military record of Lewis Ludwig; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 10438) for the relief of Philip A. Hertz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 10439) granting a pension to Alicia J. Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 10440) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Harlan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10441) for the relief of T. M. Marsh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 10442) granting an increase of pension to Jane Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10443) granting an increase of pension to James W. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10444) granting an increase of pension to Margaret B. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 10445) granting an increase of pension to Matilda C. Boulden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 10446) to restore the name of Mrs. C. A. Bennett to the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 10447) granting a pension to Alice A. Masters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10448) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10449) granting a pension to Allen E. Gabbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10450) granting an increase of pension to Mourning Sizemore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10451) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Senters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10452) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 10453) granting an increase of pension to Spencer Philipps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10454) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 10455) granting a pension to Mary P. E. Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 10456) granting a pension to Emma J. De Yoe Bassett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 10457) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OGLESBY: A bill (H. R. 10458) granting a pension to William A. M. Streeter, alias Henry Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGSDALE: A bill (H. R. 10459) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Beaverdam Baptist Church, Marlboro County, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 10460) granting a pension to Sarah J. Challoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10461) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph Scharbonaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 10462) granting a pension to Henry Padoult; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10463) for the relief of Clarence F. Birkett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 10464) granting a pension to Julia A. Dugan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10465) granting an increase of pension to William H. Surridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10466) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Trapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10467) granting an increase of pension to Orlando D. Rowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10468) granting a pension to Augustus Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10469) granting a pension to George M. Laquey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10470) for the relief of Michael Feeler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10471) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Bristol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10472) granting an increase of pension to Amanda M. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10473) granting a pension to Cab Acuff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10474) for the relief of Andrew J. Sutton, alias Sedney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10475) granting an increase of pension to Gabriella Ware; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 10476) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 10477) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Donohoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10478) granting a pension to Carrie H. Moffatt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 10479) granting a pension to George G. Spurr, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 10480) granting a pension to Gertrude H. Bird; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10481) granting a pension to Anna Wehle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10482) granting an increase of pension to Abel Longworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10483) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of St. Louis, urging the adoption of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, urging that the railway mail pay controversy be referred to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), memorial of Travelers' Protective Association, indorsing the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of John Schaab and 450,000 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against increase of tax on beer, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany the bill (H. R. 9144) for relief of John Irvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 10321, for relief of John R. Tallentire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of Better Sox Knitting Mills, of Fort Atkinson, Wis., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of directors of Fox Lake Public Library and members of Randolph (Wis.) Public Library, protesting against the Ayres bill (H. R. 4715); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of depositors in banks of Kansas, against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petitions of Hon. John K. Stewart, of Amsterdam, and United States Silk Co., of Gloversville, N. Y., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Resolutions by the Church Federation of Sacramento, Cal., favoring bills creating a national play bureau and appropriation for its maintenance, and creating the Grand Canyon, Mount Baker, and Sequoia National Parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions by the Society of the Sons of the Revolution, in the State of California, favoring the development of a practicable system of national preparedness against war and a system of military training for all able-bodied male pupils under the age of 18 years in our public schools; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: Petition of Fitzgerald (Vt.) Paper Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, relative to erection of statue to nuns on battlefield; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Edgar F. Luckenbach, of New York, relative to bill to amend section 4444, United States Revised Statutes, relating to regulation of steam vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Kings County (N. Y.) Pharmaceutical Society, favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Kingston (N. Y.) Local, No. 251, favoring passage of workmen's compensation bill (H. R. 476); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEWALT: Petitions of Mohnton Knitting Mill, Allentown Silk Co., James H. Wagner Co., Stony Creek Mills, Louis

Kraemer & Co., all of Pennsylvania, favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of Cigar Makers' Union No. 44, of St. Louis, in favor of the Keating-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of William McKinley Camp, No. 33, of West Hoboken, N. J., in favor of House bill 54; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Kingston Local, No. 251, favoring the workingmen's compensation bill—H. R. 476; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., favoring submitting the question of railway mail pay to the Interstate Commerce Commission for investigation and report to Congress; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Corporal William White Camp, No. 4, of Denver, Colo., in favor of House bill 54; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of American Association for Labor Legislation, New York, favoring House bill 476, workmen's bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Travelers' Protective Association, favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of grape growers of twenty-second district of Ohio, against the Overmyer bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of United Spanish War Veterans, St. Louis, Mo., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FARR: Petition of Miss F. Roos, corresponding secretary of the City Improvement Association, favoring the enactment of the Keating-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Mrs. R. P. Gleason, president of Century Club, Scranton, Pa., favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of N. K. Younis, M. E. Comerford, L. A. De Groff, and L. A. Larrell, of Scranton, Pa., against censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, favoring the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Central Union Labor Council of Greater New York, favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to convict-labor goods; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of independent retail merchants of Kings County, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Edgar F. Luckenbach, of New York, favoring bill for regulation of steam vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Department of Betterment, of Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, favoring passage of House bill 476, workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Woman's Republican Club of New York, favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of women of Seventy-six Chapter, Daughters of American Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Theatrical Protective Union of New York, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hins & Frond Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of piano manufacturers of New York, favoring passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Pacific Fisheries Society, of Portland, Oreg., relative to appropriation for commercial fisheries of the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Ransom, Ill., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Free Methodist Church, Belvidere, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARR: Petition of sundry citizens of Scranton, Pa., against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Association of Eastern Foresters, favoring reenactment of the Weeks law relative to forests of New England; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Ladies' Auxiliary Ancient Order of Hibernians of America, of Holyoke and Revere, Mass., relative to erection of monument in memory of the nuns of the battle field; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARRETT: Petition of 25 people of Kenton County, Tenn., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of Kenton, Tenn., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Tennessee, favoring enactment of a law prohibiting the sale of whisky in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GORDON: Memorial of J. R. Johnson, protesting against censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of Bennington Hosiery Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Petition of Western Implement, Vehicle & Hardware Association, relative to sisal fiber output in Yucatan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAY: Petitions of 538 people of Dayton, Va., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce, for an emergency appropriation for construction of Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Santa Cruz, relative to congestion of freight at ocean docks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Matilda C. Boulden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: Memorial of Robert Lansing, St. Louis Chapter, American Institute of Architects, protesting against House bill 743; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of John O. Feeney, of Providence; and Hope Council, No. 398, Knights of Columbus, favoring passage of House bill 4699, to make October 12 of each year a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Universal Winding Co., protesting against Dietrick amendment to the Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of citizens of Comstock, Nebr., favoring House joint resolution for congress of neutral nations to promote peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Boelus and St. Libory, Nebr., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Watertown Chamber of Commerce and Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Charles W. Van Valkenburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: Petitions of 350 people of Polo, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Memorial of board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Wilmington, Del., favoring passage of House bill 9673, relative to compulsory pilotage of barges; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Memorial of McFarland Lumber Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., and Howard L. Neff, of Philadelphia, in favor of the Small bill in reference to pilotage of barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), memorial of James H. Martin and H. C. Deasdorf, of Pittsburgh, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Edward A. Pumely, of New York, favoring a change of international law in reference to freedom of the seas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of United Spanish War Veterans, of St. Louis, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Joseph P. Byers, of Philadelphia, favoring establishment of a home for feeble-minded persons in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), memorial of Travelers' Protective Association, of Omaha, Nebr., and American Fair Trade League, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), memorial of John B. Andrews, A. A. for L. L., in favor of House bill 476; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of National Pipe and Supplies Association, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of J. W. Brooker, in favor of changing the pension laws; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., in favor of submitting the railway mail pay controversy to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of 75 people of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Painted Post, N. Y., favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 50 people of the First Baptist Church of Painted Post, N. Y., favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of Stockton Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Henry Street Settlement, New York, favoring the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 10195, granting an increase of pension to Merritt D. En Earl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of J. H. Layton, Asbury Park; M. L. Pyle, Bradley Beach; P. M. Tague, Asbury Park; L. T. Bennett, Jamesburg; and W. M. Appleby & Son, Old Bridge, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring Stevens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Richard J. Gmen, Long Branch, N. J., favoring resolution ordering embargo upon further shipments of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of Mrs. W. F. Roberts, Mrs. W. H. Harrington, Mrs. Ella McCay, Mrs. Clara M. Wilson, Mrs. Mabel Brannock, Mrs. Annie Jenkins, Mrs. E. B. Hay, Mrs. M. Trimble, Mrs. M. E. Taylor, Lottie Allen, Miss Eveline Delameter, Mrs. R. M. Hinckley, all of Saranac Lake, N. Y., in behalf of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance Association, in Rome and Westmoreland, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: Petition of 502 people of Storm Lake, Iowa, for a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of New England Shoe and Leather Association, favoring a nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hope Council, No. 398, Knights of Columbus, of Providence, R. I., favoring the bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring national preparedness and an adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Universal Winding Co., of Providence, R. I., protesting against abolishing the Taylor system in Government establishments; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Providence, R. I., favoring extension of the appropriation to continue the purchase of Federal forest reserves in New England; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of citizens of Minnesota, favoring House joint resolution 81, for embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of sundry citizens of Pasadena, Los Angeles, and Intercollegiate Socialist Society of Los Angeles, Cal., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Stockton (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club of Oakland, Cal., favoring appropriation for two new vessels, for carrying on work of surveying Pacific coast; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Pauline Ames, of Pasadena, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Christopher F. Sweeney, of Boston, Mass., asking for the impeachment of Judge George A. Carpenter, of the United States district court of northern Illinois, eastern division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Rev. W. C. Lyon and others, of Valley City, N. Dak., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 31, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, millions of hearts turn to Thee day by day in the confident expectation that Thou wilt keep our Nation in safety and in peace. We thank Thee that the heart of the people still beats true to its ancient ideals. We thank Thee for the moral heroism of the people that answer to the challenge of spiritual supremacy. We pray that we may still keep true to those great spiritual revelations that Thou hast made to men and understand that the highest honor lies in the higher realm of life. Do Thou guide us this day and keep us true to the precepts of Thy word. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN GAS LIGHT CO. (S. DOC. NO. 266).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

EAST WASHINGTON HEIGHTS TRACTION CO. (S. DOC. NO. 267).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co. for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10037) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing for the printing or the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing for the printing and binding of 10,000 copies of the report of the medico-military aspects of the European war, by Surg. A. M. Fauntleroy, United States Navy, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing for the printing and binding of 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing for the printing and binding of 100,000 copies of the special report on the diseases of cattle, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a memorial to the Congress of the United States from the Corby Co., a yeast manufactory in the District of Columbia. The Chair is in doubt as to the proper disposition of the memorial and will therefore order it to lie on the table.

Mr. WORKS. I have a telegram from William Bayard Hale, of New York, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, January 30, 1916.

Senator WORKS.

Bellevue Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

If the President does not know, as he declared at Cleveland, what any day, yes, or hour, may bring forth, can Congress be too quick in taking action to prepare for crisis? First step would necessarily be to keep ammunition and war supplies at home. If peril of which the President warns country is from direction of England or Japan, we are criminally foolish to continue shipping ammunition to allies. If it is from Germany that peril threatens, it would be absolutely averted if exportation of ammunition to Germany enemies were stopped. In either case, therefore, our own safety and best interests demand immediate embargo on ammunition. If the President feels crisis so imminent as to necessitate dramatic appeal to the people, does it not lie upon Congress to take instant action to conserve the Nation's military resources by forbidding exportation?

WILLIAM BAYARD HALE,
362 Riverside Drive.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I present a resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, which I ask may be read.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States is engaged in the discussion of ways and means necessary to place and keep the United States of America in its proper position among the first powers of the world; and

Whereas the passage of H. R. 7617 of the House of Representatives of the United States, hereinafter referred to, may result in the construction of one or more post roads through the State of Maryland, much to the benefit of the citizens and taxpayers thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved by the members of the House of the General Assembly of Maryland, That the United States Senators and Members of Congress from this State be, and are hereby, urged and requested to aid and cooperate in the passage by Congress of H. R. 7617, known as the rural post roads bill:

Further resolved, That the chief clerk of this house be, and he is hereby, instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from this State.

Mr. MYERS. I present a petition signed by the teacher and pupils of the Spring Hill School, Polson, Mont., for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the Flathead reclamation project in that State. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD, together with the name of the teacher of the school, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President and Congress of the United States:

We the undersigned members of the Spring Hill Schoolhouse do respectfully petition the President and Congress of the United States that an appropriation of at least \$1,000,000 be granted by this session of Congress for work on the Flathead irrigation project for the ensuing year. It is quite essential that a substantial appropriation be made for this purpose so that the work may be expedited and an early completion of the project be assured.

We most earnestly urge that the settlers and Indians holding land under this project get the appropriation they are asking for.

Respectfully submitted.

GRACE GADAUD, Teacher
(And many others).

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Jeannette Mathew Lord, of Hanover, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of E. E. Wells, of Lebanon Springs, N. Y., praying for a continuation of the appropriations for the purchase of forest reserves in the Appalachian Mountains, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of Joseph Wild & Co., of New York City, N. Y., and a petition of the Nassau Felt Mills, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of 600 citizens of Elkhart, Ind., and a petition of 400 citizens of Plainfield, Ind., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of Kent Chapter, Michigan Society Sons of the American Revolution, of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for an appropriation for the construction of a national archives building in Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of Grand Traverse Grange, No. 379, Patrons of Husbandry, of Traverse City, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide Government inspection